

1961

B. Applications must be fully documented with evidence which will clearly establish that all the conditions enumerated in A above exist.

C. Mental instability, immaturity, psychoneuroses, climatic allergies, retarded children, problems confronting in-laws, indebtedness, contemplated retirement, and purchase of homes are not normally a basis for reassignment.

SECTION II

1. Category: Deferment from entry on active duty of members of the National Guard and Army Reserve who have received active duty orders.

2. Apply to:

A. Members of National Guard units to unit commander who, if he approves, will forward to State adjutant general for final decision.

B. Members of Army Reserve units to unit commander who, if he approves, will forward to corps or Army commander for final decision.

C. Individual reservists not members of units directly to corps commander for final decision.

3. Considerations:

A. The following may be considered as a basis to apply for deferment from entry on active duty:

1. A member pursuing graduate studies on a full-time basis in a field of primary interest to the Army.

2. A member whose entry on active duty will result in extreme personal or community hardship.

B. Reference 2 above. It must be remembered that the involuntary call up of National Guard and Army Reservists will impose hardships on them, their families, and their communities. National Guard and Reserve units have been screened annually to remove from them those individuals who could not be expected to serve on active duty in case of national need. Under the circumstances, it is considered that no individual will qualify for deferment on a personal or community hardship basis unless it can be established that his call to active duty will create problems very much more severe than will be created by the call to active duty of any other member of the Reserve or National Guard.

SECTION III

1. Category: Deferment from overseas assignment.

2. Apply to unit commander who, if he approves, will forward through military channels as follows, for final decision:

A. Thirty days or less, installation commander.

B. Thirty-one to ninety days, Army or comparable major commander.

C. Over 90 days, the Adjutant General, Department of the Army.

3. Considerations:

A. The same general conditions must exist as prescribed for compassionate reassignment and the same documentation is required. See action I, paragraphs 3a and 3b.

B. The increased movement of military personnel overseas and the suspension of movement of dependents to Western Europe require that only the

most meritorious cases be considered. Family separations, ordinary pregnancies, and financial difficulties are not in themselves a basis for deferment.

SECTION IV

1. Category: Movement of dependents overseas.

2. Apply to: The serviceman himself on receipt of PCS orders must apply to the oversea commander through military channels for authority for dependents to accompany him to or join with him in his oversea assignment.

3. Considerations:

A. Determination of whether movement of dependents will be authorized is based on:

1. Approval of the oversea commander.

2. Availability of quarters in the command.

3. Availability of transportation and other logistical support such as schools, commissaries, post exchanges, and medical facilities.

4. Operational requirements of the unit and the command.

B. After the oversea commander has authorized the movement of dependents, the transportation terminal commander of the respective Army area will contact the family, provide necessary assistance, and issue movement orders. Under no circumstances should movement to the port commence until a firm port call is received.

C. Government sponsored movement of dependents to Western Europe, except to Berlin, will be suspended on October 9, 1961. Dependents of affected personnel will be moved to designated locations within the United States at Government expense.

SECTION V

1. Category: Early separation from active duty, all components—Regular Army, Reserve, National Guard—on active duty.

2. Apply to:

A. Officers:

1. Regular Army to unit commander who forwards through military channels to Department of the Army for final decision.

2. Other than Regular Army to unit commander who forwards through military channels to major commander, or Department of the Army as appropriate, for final decision.

B. Enlisted personnel: To unit commander, who, if he approves, forwards through military channels to the Army or major oversea commander for final decision, except requests for separation in the national health, safety, or interest, which must be forwarded to the Department of the Army.

3. Considerations:

Early releases from active duty for any reason have been suspended except for those in the best interests of the service. Best interests of the service include those actions in lieu of elimination or court-martial and those cases wherein undue personal or family hardship is established. In this connection, the circumstances must be established as being not only substantially more severe than those experienced by other personnel on active duty but also more severe than

those which will be experienced by the individual who would have to be drafted or recalled to active duty from civilian life as his replacement.

SECTION VI

1. Category: Applications for direct commissions.

2. Apply to:

A. Enlisted personnel on active duty to unit commander who will forward through military channels to the Army commander or Department of the Army, as appropriate, for final action.

B. Members of Reserve and National Guard units not on active duty to unit commander who will forward through military channels to appropriate headquarters for final decision.

C. Individual reservists and persons with no military service to Army corps which will provide information, guidance, and necessary forms.

3. Consideration:

A. There are a wide variety of programs through which both Regular and Reserve commissions in the Army may be obtained. The criteria for each varies but in general, applicants must be citizens of the United States, between the ages of 18 and 27, have at least a high school education, and be mentally, morally, and physically qualified.

B. Because of the necessity for careful selection, processing of applications for commissions is time consuming and may be expected to require 3 to 6 months for final action. Thus individuals who have been alerted for active duty, either through the Selective Service System or as a member of the Reserve components cannot expect to apply and be commissioned before they enter on active duty. However, the fact that an applicant enters on active duty as an enlisted person will have no bearing on a pending application for commission. If appointed as an officer, the individual can be ordered to active duty directly from enlisted status.

SECTION VII

1. Category: Recall to active duty of Reserve and National Guard officers.

2. Apply to:

A. Enlisted personnel on active duty who hold Reserve commissions: To unit commander who will forward through military channels to the Department of the Army for final decision.

B. Individuals not on active duty in any status directly to Army Corps for information, administrative processing, assistance, necessary forms, and forwarding to the Department of the Army for final decision.

3. Considerations:

The major need is for the younger company grade officers with limited need for certain field grade specialists. Competition for present vacancies is keen, as the emphasis is on quality rather than quantity. Processing of application will require 60 to 90 days.

SECTION VIII

1. Category: Change of length or date of commencement of active duty tour of commissioned ROTC graduates.

2. Apply to:

Birch file
September 25

A. Students not yet commissioned to professor of military science at the university who will forward to Army commander for final decision.

B. Commissioned and on active duty to unit commander, who, if he approves, will forward through military channels to Department of the Army for final decision.

C. Commissioned, but not yet on active duty will be ordered to active duty as now scheduled unless earlier call is required. Apply directly to Army commander.

3. Considerations:

A. Prior to August 22, 1961, some ROTC graduates were granted 6 months' active duty training tours. Effective August 22 all ROTC graduates were to be ordered to extended active duty for 24 months and those already on 6 months' active duty training tours were extended for 1 year.

B. When individuals accept an ROTC contract, together with the assistance provided by the Army, they agree to serve on active duty for a minimum of 2 years. Thus, it is considered that changes can be justified only for personal or community hardship of an extreme nature.

SECTION X

1. Category: Transfer to the Standby Reserve.

2. Apply to:

A. Members of the National Guard to unit commander who, if he approves will forward to State Adjutant General for final decision. Note: Since National Guard has only Ready Reserve units, if approved, individual will be discharged and automatically transferred to Army Reserve.

B. Members of Army Reserve units to unit commander who if he approves will forward to the corps commander for final decision.

C. Individual members of Ready Reserve not assigned to a unit directly to corps commander.

3. Considerations—General categories which may qualify:

A. Individuals who have completed service and/or Ready Reserve obligation.

1. All Ready Reserve obligations and all enlistments in Ready Reserve components which would have ordinarily expired between October 1, 1961, and June 30, 1962, are automatically extended 1 year. Those members of the 32d Infantry Division, 49th Armored Division, and supporting forces ordered to active duty in October 1961 by Department of the Army message dated September 19, 1961, whose obligations or enlistments expire prior to October 1, 1961, are also extended by 1 year.

2. Because of the various combinations of service which satisfy reserve obligations, individuals in doubt concerning their current status should communicate directly with the corps commander.

B. Those engaged in critical civilian occupations provided they do not possess critical military skills.

C. Those whose mobilization will result in extreme personal or community hardship. See section II, paragraph 3b, for definition.

The John Birch Society: Pros and Cons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OR

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1961

MR. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the May 19, 1961 issue of Civic Affairs Monthly, a publication of Civic Affairs Associates, Inc., the address of which is 2612 P Street NW, Washington, D.C., an excellent analysis of the pros and cons relative to the John Birch Society. As a member of the society, I am anxious that people have an opportunity to know the strong points of the society as well as its vulnerabilities in order that they may come to an independent evaluation of the society. I, therefore, under unanimous consent include the article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

To anyone seriously interested in politics and how to be effective in it, an understanding of the John Birch Society can be very useful. The important points to understand are:

1. The conditions which led to its founding.
2. How it operates.
3. The mechanics of "action groups."
4. Strong points of the Birch Society.
5. Vulnerabilities of the Birch Society.
6. Prospects of the Birch Society.
7. Significance to the reader.

CONDITIONS WHICH LED TO FOUNDING OF BIRCH SOCIETY

The most important question of today is whether nations will be organized to promote individual freedom and free enterprise or whether they will be organized under a state-owned and run collectivized system with consequent reduction of the individual's political and economic freedom. On one hand there are those who believe in our American system of individual liberty and free enterprise. On the other, there are those who believe in the Communist system of complete state authority and ownership of economic institutions. On the other hand, also, are those who favor a much larger role for government and are moving in the direction of a collectivized, state-dominated society—not affiliated with the Communist conspiracy.

Everyone is, or should by now be, familiar with the well-organized, purposeful, total effort directed from Moscow and Peking to bring about world revolution. This effort includes preparation for armed conflict, intelligence activities, propaganda, and the organization of subversive groups of citizens in every non-Communist country. These groups are carefully manipulated, oriented and directed under discipline by trained experts in agitation and propaganda to mobilize opinion on behalf of Communist objectives and in opposition to anti-Communist activities and groups. They work to infiltrate important institutions such as the government, the press, the churches, the schools, trade unions and other key organizations which can serve as vehicles for propaganda and indoctrination. These activities are covert. They are aimed at undermining existing institutions and bringing about the replacement of free government by Communist domination.

Those who believe in a larger role for government, centralization of power in gov-

ernment, and government domination or ownership of industry—but are not affiliated with the Communist conspiracy—generally are inspired by humanitarian ideals and believe that people will be better off under a planned, collectivized system. While they seek greater power for government, they deny that this is at the expense of individual freedom. These groups—riding under the banners of "change," "reform," and "progress"—are idealistic and have great appeal to the "have-nots," the discontents, and people with strong charitable and underdog feelings. They are generally strongly motivated and reasonably well organized.

Those who believe in free enterprise, decentralization of authority, limited government and other traditional American ideas are usually not well organized. Being generally in the category of "haves" (as opposed to "have-nots"), they are content with things the way they are, take it for granted they will stay that way, and devote their time and energies to improving their individual status in the community, economically and socially. Being self-reliant and individualistic, they do not readily organize politically. Being possessed of a certain status, they are cautious and reluctant to become controversial through political activity. Becoming controversial may interfere with their efforts to maintain their economic and social status.

This group tends to restrict its political efforts to giving money to those who will enter the political lists on their behalf.

In recent years, this group has begun to realize that they are losing in a fight to the finish with the collectivists to retain the kind of system under which they have done so well. Conservative and libertarian publications such as National Review and Human Events have acquired followings. Young Americans for Freedom and the Collegiate Society of Individualists have been organized and have shown a phenomenal growth. The National Chamber of Commerce has led a drive to get businessmen active in politics with their do-it-yourself action course in practical politics.

Another manifestation of this "awakening of the right" has been the John Birch Society. Robert Welch, former vice president of a Boston candy company, becoming aware of the threat to the way of life traditionally enjoyed in this country, is determined to oppose the forces of the left by building an organization which will systematically fight to keep our system, using the same kind of discipline, agitation-propaganda know-how, and tactics that the collectivists have been using successfully for years.

HOW THE BIRCH SOCIETY OPERATES

Analysis of problem

Robert Welch, the founder and leader of the society, sets forth in his "Blue Book" an analysis of the problem: Collectivism, or socialism, is a contagious cancer characteristic of societies which have passed their peak and are decaying. European nations are already badly infected, and the infection has spread to the United States.

He does not differentiate between communism and domestic collectivism or socialism, but believes they are one and the same, the "liberals" or "leftwingers" being simply Communists in sheep's clothing—or "Communist dupes."

Welch states that the Communists' goal of world conquest is about two-thirds complete. There is very little time left to turn back the tide.

According to Welch, the Communist takeover of the United States is planned by four methods:

1. Infiltration, subversion and propaganda—a fifth column or Trojan horse.
2. Fomenting civil war in the United States and backing one side.

3. Inducing the gradual surrender of U.S. sovereignty to the United Nations while working to get control of the United Nations organization.

4. Completing the transition of America from a free society to a socialist or collectivist one where economic and political institutions will be close enough to communism so that merger will be logical and easy.

Welch also maintains that Communist (including liberal and leftwing) influences are today so strong even within the United States that it is difficult, nearly impossible, to get anti-Communist information into the press and other media of communication.

While it is very late, Welch believes there is still time to save the free world from communism.

Purpose of Birch Society

The purpose of the Birch Society is to awaken the people of America to the threat as seen by Welch and recruit as many as possible of them as members to work together against communism. While the principal area of action is the United States, Welch's purpose is to expand the Birch Society into a virile, anti-Communist movement in other countries that are still free, and possibly even behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Birch Society methods

Welch proposes that the society be militant and adopt the same effective techniques used by Communists and others to agitate and propagandize for their cause.

While the society has no other sanctions available to it than expelling members, Welch would enforce discipline within the membership. This he considers necessary for effective action and as a counterinstrument to anticipated Communist infiltration of the society.

Specifically, Welch lists 10 methods of operation:

1. Establish reading rooms or libraries of anti-Communist literature.

2. Promote and expand radio coverage of conservative commentators.

3. Promote expansion of conservative and anti-Communist publications.

4. Encourage letter writing campaigns to newspapers, Government officials, etc., on behalf of anti-Communist causes.

5. Form front groups to agitate and propagandize for worthwhile causes. Urge Birch members to join existing groups with community standing, try to get them to understand the problem and take positions supporting the various causes the Birch Society is promoting.

6. Expose the covert activities of Communists.

7. Heckle Communists and other opposition speakers at meetings.

8. Form speakers bureaus; endeavor to obtain platforms for conservative, libertarian, and anti-Communist speakers.

9. Form local Birch Society chapters at home and abroad.

10. Take an active part in political campaigns, both inside political parties and out.

In addition, the Birch Society publishes a magazine entitled "American Opinion," distributes bulletins to its members and circulates the "Blue Book" and the "White Book" which explain the movement and promote its ideas.

Each chapter of the society has a leader appointed by Welch, all of whom serve without pay. The society employs regional field men to direct activities and stimulate local action. Welch draws no salary. Headquarters is Belmont, Mass.

Mechanics of "action groups" (such as the Birch Society, COPE, the ADA, Young Americans for Freedom, etc.)

Those who wish to influence public policy may write their Congressmen, they may become active in their political party, they

may write letters to the editor, or contribute articles or even start a publication of their own. They may also organize an "action group."

Action groups work to enlist public support for one or more causes. They issue statements, hold demonstrations or rallies, and agitate in various ways to make themselves known and get their views across. Fundamentally, they try to build a climate of opinion favorable to their cause and unfavorable to their opposition. They do not worry about being controversial, assuming that if effective, they will be attacked and smeared in an effort to discredit them. Likewise, they will attempt to discredit groups that oppose them.

They often tend to be extreme or sensational in their views. This may be necessary in order to obtain support. It has been found that an appeal to the emotions is far more effective than some sort of reasoned, moderate appeal. While this can be necessary to rouse support, it also narrows the number of people who may be inclined to respond, since most people are not attracted by extremist causes. It likewise makes the groups vulnerable since extremism makes most people react with caution, avoidance, or negative feelings.

Action groups, like political campaigns, tend to attract neurotics. A cause supplies them with a needed emotional outlet. Such people often work the hardest, contribute the most money, but also make statements which are open to ridicule and horror.

Nevertheless, action groups rank high as a means of developing public support for causes, and eventually making the desired impression on public policy.

STRONG POINTS OF BIRCH SOCIETY

While it is difficult to assess the validity of Welch's belief that communism is now two-thirds of the way toward success in world domination (many think less, some think more), there is a strong, widespread, growing feeling that we are losing the cold war. Abroad, communism continues to advance. While its progress slowed during the Eisenhower administration in terms of countries taken over (Tibet, South Vietnam, Cuba), the growing discontent in South America, the obvious success of Communist penetration in Africa, and the deterioration of the Lao situation, have caused grave concern.

Following the anti-Communist alarms on the domestic front from 1948 through 1954, efforts to expose Communist activities in the United States have fallen off, but many suspect the Communists are active and growing in influence—simply not being publicized.

It is this feeling that we are losing—well exploited by Kennedy in his campaign—that provides fertile ground for formation of a virile anti-Communist action organization.

Those genuinely disturbed by Communist gains and successes are anxiously looking for some vehicle through which they can work to help win the fight. The Birch Society has provided an organization and a program in which they can participate and feel effective.

The discipline imposed on members, the air of purpose, the supplying of an interpretation of history, and a positive program of activity, all are important ingredients in the success of the society.

VULNERABILITIES

Any action group that is effective will be attacked by those whom it opposes. This is particularly true when that opposition is the Communist Party. The Communists are out to win; they will brook no opposition and will stop at nothing. To the degree that they have been successful in infiltrating the community they are effective in passing the word and getting their interpretation of events across.

In addition, there is the hostility noted above by the vast majority of people toward extremist causes, whether of the political left, or the right.

In view of these known hazards, it is wise of action groups to couch their public appeals in acceptable terms and to base them on provable facts. To do otherwise is simply to supply opponents with ammunition. Here are some characteristics which render the Birch Society vulnerable:

1. Implausible statements: The suggestion that President Eisenhower, his brother, and John Foster and Allan Dulles are or were Communists or conscious workers for Communist causes, even if true would not be believed except by the most credulous. This one piece of nonsense casts doubt on the whole fabric.

As William Buckley of National Review expresses it, "a man's subjective motives (cannot) automatically be deduced from the objective consequences of his acts." If they could, Stanley Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain would be Nazis because their policies allowed Hitler to develop into a viable menace.

2. Being unable to distinguish between communism and socialism lays Welch and the society open to severe criticism. While we may want neither system, and while socialism may be an entering wedge for communism, it is incorrect and unfair to the high and humane motives of socialists and liberals to impute that they are conscious members of the Communist conspiracy.

3. Pattern thinking: This is a trap into which many anti-Communists unwittingly fall. Because the Communists are skilled in disguising their work, the student of communism soon finds that he can detect their operations only by becoming aware of familiar patterns, then tracing back. The experienced student of communism becomes adept at this and is usually correct. However, the appearance of a pattern is not enough, of itself, to prove anything. Hard evidence is necessary. Where Welch thinks he sees a pattern, he often considers this sufficient evidence of itself.

As an example, one of the commonest plays of Communists in smearing opponents is to label them Fascists or Nazis. Experienced students say that when a group is labeled with one of these titles, 9 times out of 10 (unless it is an overtly racist group deserving such a label) you can trace this labeling back to a Communist or pro-Communist source. This does not mean the person who said it is a Communist. Time magazine, in an article, called the "Blue Book" Welch's "Mein Kampf"—an obvious slur designed to hang the Nazi label on Welch. The "pattern thinker" might jump to conclusions, whereas a careful look will simply show that Time's thorough researchers probably picked up some of their background from the Peoples World, the official West Coast Communist Party publication. Two other characteristics of the Time article trace back to the same source. No one, however, should suggest that Time, its research staff, or librarians are Communist.

4. Faulty research: A year ago, Welch wrote that the national chamber action course in practical politics is slanted to encourage the selection of leftwing candidates. He therefore suggested that the chamber had been infiltrated. The reference was to the case study for session No. 6. A check would reveal that the author of the case study was Biehl Clarke of Civic Affairs Associates, who—we are in a position to assure you—is neither Communist nor even leftwing.

5. Semantics: In any effort designed to influence public opinion, one tries to put his best foot forward. The trick is to hang good labels or symbols on your cause, your organization, and hang bad labels on the causes you are opposed to. Mr. Welsh made the fundamental public relations misstep

of "calling a spade a shovel" in describing the Birch Society. Thus he calls it monolithic. This is a bad word. Instead, he could have said that a degree of discipline would be necessary in the organization.

As another example, Welch is critical of democracy as a form of government. In terms of the technical definition of democracy, the United States is not a democracy, and many political philosophers would agree that democracy is a poor form of government. But to the average person, or even the above average person, democracy is a good word, a plus symbol, and to be against it is bad or a minus symbol. The same idea could have been expressed clearly without coming out against something people consider to be good. This has made it possible to smear the Birch Society as being undemocratic—which to most people means bad.

In another case he refers to some of the 10 methods spelled out above as being mean and dirty. In this instance, he is probably over critical of his own intentions. The 10 methods are more or less conventional methods used by political organizations and action groups. Applying these adjectives, however, makes it possible to say that Welch is for punching below the belt, because he said so.

Again, Welch speaks of infiltrating established organizations. This sounds like Communist methods and is therefore bad. Yet if one says, "The Birch Society encourages its members to be active in community organizations and to speak up for what they think is right," it means the same thing, but is obviously just expressing the old American right of free speech.

In short, by his choice of words, Mr. Welch has often painted his own child in the harshest possible light and has thereby given his critics excellent ammunition.

PROSPECTS OF THE BIRCH SOCIETY

Obviously it has a market. There are large numbers of people desirous of working for a militant, anti-Communist, anticollectivist, proindividual freedom organization.

It is set up in terms of organization to be effective and to command loyalty.

It has evidently received substantial backing which has not been frightened off by the attacks on it.

In fact, the publicity it has received recently—although largely negative—has reportedly attracted new support.

Because of fundamental errors in its analysis of the present situation and because of inept framing of language in the "Blue Book," it has made itself more vulnerable than necessary.

Because it relies on the personal leadership of Robert Welch rather than strictly on principles, its continued success is an open question depending on the survival of Welch and his appeal.

While the attacks on and exposure of the society will cause some loss of support and a large degree of disapprobation, it is open to question whether the society has been or will be damaged enough to cripple or destroy it. Probably not.

Whether it has been or will be effective in its purpose of promoting individual freedom and combatting collectivism, is a question that cannot be evaluated at this time. Even at a later date, it may be difficult to judge because evidence in this kind of matter is difficult to gather and credit hard to assign. Certainly the campaign against Khrushchev's visit to the United States met with some success. To the extent that the Birch Society initiated it and participated, it did influence public policy and opinion.

SIGNIFICANCE TO READER

While participating directly in a political party organization is perhaps the most effective way of influencing public policy, on a par, or at least not far behind in impor-

tance, is developing a climate of opinion favorable to a cause. Organizing or participating in an action group is one of the most effective ways to influence the political climate.

Since action groups are generally attacked by their opposition to discredit them, those who may endanger their livelihood or community status by being identified with controversial organizations often allow themselves to be neutralized. This is part of the game. As Harry Truman once said about politics, "If you don't like the heat, stay out of the kitchen."

The reader should never be taken in, however, by reports in the press, radio, TV, etc., that put an action group in a bad light. At the most charitable, it must be considered that writers in the press are always working against deadlines and seldom have time to do thorough research; to sell their publication they must continually report conflict and stir emotions—attacking an individual or an organization is much easier and more interesting than presenting an objective, carefully documented report; in addition to the existence of writers with political convictions who slant their material, a large number of writers—like most Americans—are just naturally suspicious of militant organizations. In the case of the Birch Society, even reliable sources have printed as facts things which were not true at all. When evaluating the Birch Society, or any other group, it is essential to get back to the hard facts. Get them from reliable sources. Check them. If you don't have time to do this, suspend judgment; don't be a conclusion jumper.

(Note.—One of the things that Civic Affairs Service is organized to do is answer questions of this type on organizations and movements. To the best of our ability, we will supply factual, documented answers in reply to your queries.)

Action groups are an effective device to mobilize opinion. They need not be as controversial as the Birch Society. They may be formed to promote just about any cause, on a local, State, or national level. Their methods are effective. Readers of Civic Affairs Monthly, wishing to influence public opinion or policy on given matters, will want to consider the use of such groups. The purpose of this article is to show how such groups can work, what methods they use, and some of the pitfalls to be avoided.

Nuclear Bombs: Their Effects and What Can Be Done About Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my office received a pamphlet today on the subject of "Nuclear Bombs: Their Effects and What Can Be Done About Them." This information has been compiled and written in plain language which can be easily understood by the average layman. The Honorable WILLIAM H. BATES, of Massachusetts, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, is the author. My office has been besieged with requests for information concerning fallout and its effects and what can be done to protect the public in the event of a nuclear attack. The American people are ready

to meet the challenge of any potential enemy in a courageous way. They will not be bullied or bluffed and they simply want to know what is the best way to meet any possible attack. I believe that Congressman BATES has made a great contribution by having this article printed. I feel it should be brought to the attention of the Members of Congress. Of course, all of us hope and pray that the day will never come when fallout shelters will be placed in use. We all hope that answers to the problems that might lead to a catastrophic war will be resolved and a solution for world peace will be realized in our time. President John F. Kennedy has broadened the program for civil defense. Local officials are enlarging their programs and I feel the apathy which has been so evident in the past is beginning to lessen. We do not want to alarm the American people but precautionary steps must be taken for the protection of our citizens. I include Congressman BATES' article.

NUCLEAR BOMBS: THEIR EFFECTS AND WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT THEM

(By Congressman WILLIAM H. BATES, Republican of Massachusetts, member of Joint Committee on Atomic Energy)

The recent resumption of Soviet nuclear tests and the general concern about a thermonuclear war has developed great interest in questions of nuclear bombs and resulting fallout. The following questions and answers give an insight into some of these problems.

Why are we interested in fallout shelters?

Fallout in an atomic war as well as blast, heat, and initial radiation from the bomb could kill millions of people. Fallout shelters could save the lives of about 45 million people in the event there was an atomic attack on the United States. Any kind of material between you and the fallout—as well as distance—will cut down on the radiation reaching you. Specially designed shelters, called fallout shelters, are very effective in providing protection against atomic bomb attack.

In our joint committee hearings it was brought out that civil defense preparedness could reduce the fatalities in an assumed attack on the United States from about 25 percent of the population to about 3 percent. It was also brought out that more than 96 million people in the United States do not live in or near likely target areas and therefore not in the likely area of direct or near direct hits of atomic bombs. The people not in the area of direct hits could be expected to survive by using adequately supplied fallout shelters.

Dr. Edward Teller, father of the H-bomb was recently quoted as stating that 9 out of 10 persons in the United States could be saved by using adequate fallout shelters.

What is fallout?

It is the radioactive debris from a nuclear bomb which has been airborne and deposited on the earth. This debris could be in the form of solids such as dust which could be seen or individual atoms which could not be seen. It could fall in dry form or it could be brought to earth by rain or snow. The invisible rays, called radiation, given off by the fallout material causes injury to the body and if a large amount of such radiation is received it causes death.

Local or close-in fallout occurs almost immediately and continues for 10 to 20 hours after detonation. This is the most dangerous fallout. Intermediate fallout (which comes from the troposphere up to a height of approximately 50,000 feet) takes place during the first few weeks after the

January 26

And upon that answer depends the survival of every noblest and highest value we possess—our very lives, our families, our homes, our associations and institutions yes, our very civilization itself.

Fortunately, our university has taught us that unless man is free to worship God, he has no freedom whatsoever.

She has taught us respect for the virtue of patriotism. She has shown us the panorama of history. She has taught us to see those shining figures whose courage in the darkest, hopeless moment turned disaster into victory and reaffirmed the fact that man is neither the creature nor the slave of blind chance.

This awareness of history makes us realize that our courageous President, John F. Kennedy, is confronted with decisions of importance—with problems, the resolution of which might well decide the fate of freedom for centuries to come. He is meeting these issues with valor and intelligence. President Kennedy, as all of us, must face the grave problems of our times by applying those very principles of integrity and right reason which has been U.S.F.'s priceless gift to its students.

From the humble beginnings, the painful struggles of earlier years, the university has now to face her second century calm and assured. A citadel of strength—moral and intellectual strength—in a world unsure, timid, doubtful of its own convictions or its will to defend them.

God was good—to you and to me—when He led us to the doors of the University of San Francisco. We owe to her every support to make her second century even stronger in this troubled and confused world.

It is my prayer that God continue to bless us—so that we may put to use what we learned here—to His greater glory—to the greater glory of America—and to the greater glory of a civilized, humane, free society.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25, page 837, third column, fourth paragraph, lines 5 and 6, appears the quotation "Citizens Committee for Communist Liberties." This should read "Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

GENERAL ELECTRIC IN SYRACUSE PLAYS VITAL ROLE IN GLENN'S SPACE TRIP

(Mr. RIEHLMAN (at the request of Mr. CONTE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, without a doubt almost every pair of eyes in the Nation will be focused on Cape Canaveral this coming Saturday when Marine Lt. Col. John Glenn makes his earth-orbiting space flight. And for every pair of eyes thus focused there will be a heart riding along with Colonel Glenn in that space capsule.

We are all tremendously proud of our astronauts and of the thousands of people whose devoted efforts have gone into making this shot possible.

We in Syracuse are justifiably proud of the outstanding role played by General Electric Co. in our space program, just as we are proud of GE's overall contribution to our national security.

I am including at this point an article which appeared in the Syracuse Post-Standard on January 23, outlining in greater detail General Electric's contribution to Colonel Glenn's upcoming flight.

When Marine Lt. Col. John H. Glenn goes into orbital flight this week, a Syracuse industry will play a vital role in launching the astronaut into outer space.

The General Electric Co. has developed a radio command guidance system for the Mercury-Atlas rocket which will carry Glenn into the hoped-for three-orbital flight.

This radio guidance system performs two functions. GE officials say, that of "guidance and supplying data to the National Air and Space Agency to assist in orbit determinations."

The Mercury-Atlas will be guided by radio commands of the system and will transmit a signal to cut off its rocket engines when the precise conditions required to insert the craft into orbit are achieved.

Technicians at General Electric say that in this three-orbital Mercury flight, a small addition in the velocity could send the spacecraft into a larger orbit. To put the spacecraft into an earth-orbit, a velocity in excess of 17,400 miles per hour is required. The Mercury spacecraft is scheduled to go into orbit near Bermuda, at an altitude of about 100 miles.

And here is where GE's radio guidance system comes into effect.

Three small black boxes or beacons, two of which are similar to two-way radios, will be attached to the rocket.

The Mercury-Atlas vehicle will then be automatically tracked by radar on the ground which will follow signals from these black boxes, or beacons, on the spacecraft. The radar determines range and position.

The radio guidance system also has a rate subsystem which automatically will determine the velocity and acceleration of the Mercury-Atlas.

According to a G.E. report, this will be done by three rate antennas which will receive signals from guidance equipment aboard the Atlas launch vehicle.

SPLIT-SECOND REPORT

The guidance system, in turn, will take the information it receives on position and rate and process it through a computer on the ground to derive corrections in the flight path of the spacecraft. These corrections will be sent as commands to the Mercury-Atlas by the guidance system.

The entire process, G.E. spokesmen say, takes but a fraction of a second.

When conditions are right and the proper velocity and angle of flight are achieved to put the Mercury-Atlas into a precise orbit, the guidance system will signal the Atlas to turn off its engines.

WILL ENTER ORBIT

At this point, the spacecraft will separate from the Atlas vehicle and enter its prescribed orbit in free flight.

Glenn's spacecraft will be tracked by 18 Mercury network stations around the world which will instantaneously relay communications back to the Mercury Control Center at Cape Canaveral.

Retrorockets will be fired to slow down the Mercury spacecraft as it approaches the west coast of North America and begin to start reentry.

Following these orbits, the spacecraft would begin to enter the atmosphere over southern Florida and land in a predesignated area 1,000 miles southeast of Cape Canaveral.

DATA FROM G.E. SYSTEM

"Trajectory computations will be made by a computer at the Space Computing Center, NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center, Washington, D.C. G.E.'s radio guidance system also supplies data which assists in these orbital computations," the company's spokesman said.

The Defense Systems Department of Syracuse's General Electric Co. has been responsible, under Air Force contracts, for the design, development, production, installation, tests and checkout of radio command guidance systems at Cape Canaveral and various missile bases throughout the country.

NAME KEY PERSONS

Key persons who have made significant technical contributions to the program include Richard L. Shetler, general manager of the department; J. K. Records, manager of instrumentation and guidance product section; Dr. Lewis J. Neelands, consultant in the D.S.D. responsible for the technical direction of the radio guidance program; and R. P. Sutter, manager of products service for D.S.D. which is responsible for all radio guidance facilities at missile bases.

Others include W.T. Chapin, L. M. Barker, R. S. Grisetti, who is manager of advanced engineering, C. R. Woods and E. B. Mullen.

FOREIGN-BORN AMERICANS

(Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, as a naturalized American, born in the old country, I want to subscribe 1,000 percent to the remarks made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] in the House today.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE INVESTIGATION OF PRIME LOAN RATES PART OF LONG-TERM INTEREST BY THE ANTITRUST DIVISION IN PRESERVATION OF COMPETITION IN BANKING AND PREVENTION OF UNDUE CONCENTRATION IN THE BANKING INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. My Speaker, considerable attention has been called to the recent activities of the Antitrust Division in the field of banking. Since the Kennedy administration took office a few years ago, there have been a number of actions brought by the Division challenging bank mergers. More recently, there has been activity directed against price fixing in the banking business. We have heard criticism from Comptroller of the Currency James J. Saxon about the Department's activity in this field. However, there can be no doubt but that the Antitrust Division has clear jurisdiction in the field of banking to challenge violations of either the Sherman or the Clayton Antitrust Acts. Moreover, while there was a long period of time during the 1950's when few antitrust cases were filed against banks,

1962

Look back to the modest beginnings on Market Street. You would see, even then, young men learning to defend the truth that the state is the servant, not the master, of its citizens. You would see young minds being trained in the magnificent art of logic, the ultimate weapon against brainwashing.

And now, the University of San Francisco has embarked on her second century, with a firm program to expand its contributions to a world which sorely needs men who seek truth and abhor falsity.

Probably never before in the history of the world, or in the history of our country, has it been more difficult to winnow out the facts to find the truth. The professional distorter of fact and truth runs rampant nationally and internationally.

And never has it been more important that the truth be found and recognized as truth.

Around the world, the Communists are busily and all too successfully distorting America's aims and our deep and honest hope for peace. Never before in mankind's long and occasionally glorious history has any nation so willingly picked up the troubles of far-off people—and given so generously for wholly humanitarian reasons, as has the United States.

And yet within our own country, the extremes of right and left are clouding the truth, obscuring facts, and carrying banners of falsehood as if they were something of which to be proud. Deliberate distortions are placed on pedestals formerly reserved for honest appraisal.

We all know that intelligent national policy cannot be set without an understanding of the problems.

No doctor can prescribe without diagnosis. No lawyer can build his case without careful preparation. No legislator or administrator can adopt a policy without study and research for the basic facts.

What I find alarming today, however, is the blithe refusal to start from the facts and proceed to policy. Too many persons today—both on the far right and far left—start from lies and proceed to hysteria.

I do not argue with different opinions. I welcome the give and take of honestly opposed political views. I have long observed in Congress that our best laws are usually the result of good, healthy fights between sincere political opposites.

I do know that we will survive as a nation only so long as we know the truth and live and teach and legislate in its light. Distortion and lies deserve no place in America's arsenal against Communist lies and distortions.

How close this comes to home when we consider recent attacks on a great former Governor of California. We hear a new radical group of the far right screaming stories of his disloyalty, of all things, and demanding his impeachment from the Supreme Court.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I receive mail from many Americans in a variety of States. In my files I have more than 4,000 letters demanding that Chief Justice Earl Warren be impeached. However, not a single letter has made one charge or accusation of misfeasance or malfeasance in office or any charge that the Chief Justice has violated his oath of office. They are nothing more or less than epistles of hate and expressions of hysteria from people who do not seek the facts or the truth. In this connection I find it significant that over 95 percent of these letters have come from California. This 95 percent has come from an area about 500 miles south of San Francisco. Thank God these epistles of hate have not come from this area where U.S.F. is located and the educators at U.S.F. have labored these many years.

Now let me tell you that during his political life, Earl Warren and I were on opposite

sides of the political fence. We had some pretty good go-arounds between the two of us. But our differences were honest differences in policy, and they were based on honest facts.

The John Birchers become more than despicable by their hysterical attacks on the loyalty of that great American, Earl Warren. By this tactic, the Birchers become a danger as great as those who spread the false gospel of communism.

Among the frightening phenomena of our day are the self-styled minutemen—wild-eyed characters who are already busy recruiting their private army. We hear reports of mock skirmishes—training, they claim, for the defense of their liberties. These superpatriots, by their own admission are in violation of the Constitution which refuses private armies even to individual States of the United States.

We see bigots slandering the efforts of those who are fighting to end the curse of racial discrimination—that great blight in the attainment of our cherished democratic ideals. This is our supreme domestic challenge—to create a society of genuinely equal opportunity for all Americans regardless of race, religion, or nationality, in employment, in housing, in education—in every aspect of community life.

All of this seems to be bad enough. But when we look at the extreme left, we see equally diligent efforts to divide and sap our national strength.

All of us here tonight recall, I am sure, the call resounded in late 1945 and 1946 throughout the United States to "bring our boys home"; to drastically reduce our Armed Forces for tax savings. This movement was capitalized on by leftists to reduce our position of preparedness—this in a world still unsettled, a world critically ill.

We in the United States heeded this siren call. Did the Soviet Union? No, she retained her armament posture and continued from that time to develop her strength.

It goes without saying that we all seek a just and lasting peace—however, in pursuit of this goal we should not allow ourselves to fall prey to what can well be a leftist trap which would result in unilateral disarmament of the United States alone.

Our long held and firm desire to achieve world disarmament must continue to a basic policy goal of the United States; however, we must not be unwittingly pushed into this new siren call to unilaterally disarm. If we succumb once again to this cry, we allow the subversive left at home to capitalize on the basic fear in the heart of every American parent—fear for the lives and futures of their children. This is a fear shared equally by our President and Mrs. Kennedy for their children, I am sure.

Recently I have been confronted by persons who expressed the thought that they would rather be Red than dead.

This philosophy is abhorrent—it is founded in fear and lack of faith and is complete surrender. Where does this idea come from? It's another weapon in the leftists arsenal of psychological warfare to break down confidence, create fear, and eventually destroy our freedoms.

We have seen in a few situations attempts of deeply indoctrinated leftists to maneuver labor-management crises into chaos with a cynical disregard for the moral obligations involved and the existing machinery by which valid issues can be negotiated.

It is equally true that to the right we find enemies of labor seeking to break the efforts of workingmen to unite for their legitimate interests. For example, there are still those who will let a crippling strike drag on in order to destroy an honest union.

This then, is the climate in which we find ourselves, with the light of truth too often hidden behind clouds of irresponsibility and storms of hate, malice and fear.

If the climate is to be improved, if we are to find our way safely through his maze of falsehood, truth must lead the way.

There are newspapermen among us tonight who bear heavy responsibility for finding and passing on the truth. They must not only be untiring in their efforts to seek out the facts, but they must be painstaking in their skill with words so that facts are reported precisely and accurately.

There are teachers among us, and their responsibility is to build curiosity among young people and an eagerness to find the truth.

Recently Father Richard Vachon, assistant professor of law at U.S.F., wrote in an eastern law journal about the role of an attorney. I feel it applies to the judiciary as well. Father Vachon said, "Amid the sober realities of the age it is ever more clear that the lawyer must resume his leadership, not merely of the bar, but of society itself." To attain this goal, the lawyer or judge from U.S.F. must be ever zealous in his dedicated pursuit of the truth.

Those of us in public life have the obligation to get the facts and find the truth in public issues—and this in spite of the avalanche of propaganda and mechanics of pressure to which we are subjected day in and day out.

But it is not enough that journalists, teachers, lawyers, and legislators carry the fight. We need engineers, and the car salesman and the scientist who looks into the microscope. We need the mechanic; the truckdriver; the longshoreman; the housewife; the businessman and every segment of our society.

Fortunately, we of U.S.F. were trained to distinguish, to judge. We were trained to shun intellectual and political intemperance—whether of the left or right.

Look about you in this room ladies and gentlemen of U.S.F., and see the different generations which bear witness to the consistency which which our alma mater has transmitted the religious and political traditions of the Western World.

We learned from her that all men's institutions—political, legal, social, economic—spring from moral and spiritual convictions about man's nature and his destiny.

Thus it happens that tonight, when the world we know lies under such a heavy burden of doubt—doubt about the future, doubt about its capacity to resist what it most opposes, doubt about its staying power and its will to defend its deepest convictions—all of the past of this university comes to focus.

The darkness of doubt or despair may trouble some.

It does not trouble us. For we know. We know in our minds and our hearts and our souls precisely what the nature of this crisis is. We know what is at stake.

For the conflict between the free world and the slave world runs far beyond the merely political or social or economic organization of human society. It runs beyond the freedom and the rights of the human person.

It is not simply a contest for the minds of men.

It is the supreme struggle for their very souls.

The enemy moves in with brainwashing, with deceit, with the most plausible bandishments followed abruptly by the tactics of terror.

He aims his efforts at making us doubt two things. Do we have the capacity to resist? Is what we defend worth defending?

Each man must ask himself these questions in the deepest recesses of his mind and soul.

For we cannot escape answering.

Do what we will, try as we will, we cannot evade or avoid an answer.

drastically changed by Government censors from the speeches of Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Army Research and Development. These paragraphs are not classified and appeared in the New York Times of January 25.

I have engaged in this exercise to show the foolishness of what passes for Government censorship of our top military experts, and to underscore the important message that former President Eisenhower sent to the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee. As General Eisenhower has written, "Those of us who over the years have had to deal directly with the Communist leaders and system believe—unanimously, I think—that the more our people can be brought to comprehend the all-encompassing nature of the threat, the stronger will be our determination to preserve freedom at home, and the greater will be our national willingness to sacrifice to advance freedom throughout the world."

I deeply regret the remarks of President Kennedy at his press conference—January 24—in defense of party-line expressions being dictated to our top-most military officials. The contrary opinion of General Eisenhower has my wholehearted support. I feel President Kennedy has been ill advised on this subject.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 25, as shown on page 863 of the Record, in the last sentence of remarks by me at that point, occurs the word "neutralize." This is an error. The word actually was "revitalize."

I ask unanimous consent that the Record be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MIRACLE OF MOUNT ELBERT

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the American public is well known for its generosity in donating to a multitude of deserving causes almost every day of the year. Every once in awhile, one of these projects stands out from the other worthy causes because it catches the imagination and pulls at the heart-strings of America. One such fundraising project is now underway, prompted by the recent and tragic snow avalanche in my district in the State of Colorado. The project, sponsored by the radio station, KBRR, the newspaper, the Herald Democrat, and the American Legion Post No. 7 in the community of Leadville, Colo., is called: The Miracle of Mount Elbert. As my colleagues may know, on Sunday, January 21, 1962, a snow avalanche swept down from Mount Elbert crushing a number of cabins and resulting in the death of seven persons. A man and his wife survived under all that snow and, though injured, were subsequently rescued. Their two sons and another family of five, perished. Also

dug out from under the snow was a dog that, shortly after rescue, gave birth to seven puppies. Those seven puppies are being auctioned to the highest bidders on a nationwide scale with all monies going toward paying expenses and establishing a welfare fund for the two survivors. The victims cannot be restored to life, but perhaps this project can, in some measure, supply hope and courage for the saddened parents. I commend this project to the attention of my colleagues and Americans everywhere.

ELMER B. STEVENS, RESIDENT ENGINEER, THATCHER FERRY BRIDGE PROJECT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks, and include an article.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the October 6, 1961, issue of the Panama Canal Review, the official magazine published in Balboa Heights, C.Z., by the Panama Canal Company, there appears a very informative and interesting article concerning Elmer B. Stevens, the efficient engineer acting for and on behalf of the Panama Canal Company in the construction of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge across the Panama Canal at Balboa.

The name bestowed by Congress on this great inter-American bridge enterprise honors former Congressman Maurice H. Thatcher, only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, and former Member of this body; and also in historic perpetuation of the name of the Thatcher Ferry across the canal, which will be supplanted by the bridge when completed.

The bridge is being constructed to carry out agreements between our Government and that of Panama, made in recent years. The entire Thatcher Ferry Bridge project, with the approaches involved, will be constructed at an estimated cost of \$20 million.

Representative Thatcher, while serving in the Congress, was the author of legislation which provided for the establishment of the indicated ferry and connecting west side zone roadway—the ferry and roadway being officially named in his honor because of his half century of service in and out of Congress, and formerly as Commissioner and Civil Governor of the Canal Zone, in behalf of the Panama Canal enterprise and the entire Isthmus of Panama.

The carriageway of the bridge will be considerably over 300 feet above the mean sea level of the canal at the Pacific entrance of the canal, thus providing ample clearance for all vessels which may utilize the canal.

The bridge will constitute a most important link in the Inter-American Highway system and will serve, through the indefinite future, the transportation needs of both the Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, as well as the inter-American traffic system.

As shown in the article, Engineer Stevens is a man of distinguished engineering ability, and the fact that he was

chosen for the important job of seeing to it that the bridge and its approaches are constructed in strict accordance with the plans therefor, testifies to his undoubted capacity and character.

The work of the bridge enterprise, after some delay, is expected to be fully completed by next fall, and the bridge thereupon, free of all tolls, open for traffic.

Under leave accorded, the indicated article is included herewith as a part of these remarks:

[From the Panama Canal Review, Oct. 6, 1961]

ELMER B. STEVENS: BRIDGEMAN FOR CANAL

Watchdog for the Panama Canal Company on the \$20 million Thatcher Ferry Bridge project at Balboa is Elmer B. Stevens, a quiet, self-effacing civil engineer who joined the Panama Canal organization in 1936 and who probably has had more bridge experience than any other man in the Engineering and Construction Bureau.

From the time he was graduated from the University of Vermont with a civil engineering degree until he joined the bridge project, Mr. Stevens has spent a good part of his working time designing and building bridges. Because of his early association with the Canal office engineers, there have been times, however, when he says people have regarded him as a housing engineer and, therefore, a suspicious character.

Elmer, or "Steve," as he is known to his many friends and coworkers, was appointed in 1959 to the position of resident engineer for the bridge project and in this capacity is responsible for carrying out the designer's concept of the project to its physical completion. He reports to Col. Matthew C. Garrison, the Canal's engineering and construction director and contracting officer.

Riding herd on the activites of the various contracting firms which have been employed on the construction of the bridge and its approaches as well as acting as liaison man between the Canal authorities and the men building one of the largest bridges south of the Rio Grande is only part of Steve's job.

Steve has found that he also must be prepared to deal diplomatically with visitors and others seeking information and, in the process, convince the public that construction problems are not as bad as some laymen are inclined to think.

He points out that cofferdams are, after all, only construction accessories and not part of the final product. He also notes that even though the bridge substructure is being completed about 5 months behind schedule this has not delayed the final completion schedule of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge.

With one phase of the bridge work reaching a successful conclusion, Steve is prone to recall some of the lighter moments of the past 2 years. There was the time that a load of concrete grout pelted—but did not injure—a group of Balboa Heights engineers who were inspecting the bottom of a cofferdam. And the time a barge was sunk by an endless stream of wet concrete despite desperate efforts of contractor's employees to close the gate of the concrete mixing plant's loading hopper.

Recently, Steve has been sharing the successes and defeats of substructure construction with Walter Cathey, project manager for the joint contracting firms of Fruin-Colnon, LeBoeuf & Dougherty. Mr. Cathey, a retired construction man working as a consultant, was called to the bridge job about a year ago by the contracting firm and gets along with Steve just fine. Mr. Cathey, says Steve, is one of the finest rigging men in the construction business, and that is high praise in anyone's engineering language.

As proof of Mr. Cathey's ability as an expert on bridge substructure construction, Steve cites the fact that five difficult coffer-dams have been completed without mishap or delay since Mr. Cathey arrived.

In contrast to many construction men, Steve seems shy and soft spoken. But when visitors or coworkers get out of line or tend to become obstreperous, they quickly find that Steve is made of sterner stuff and is well able to hold up his end of the argument.

This ability probably was inherited from his father, a hard-working, devoted Baptist minister who had a pastorate in DeLand, Fla., where Steve was born, and who subsequently took his family to Sioux City, Iowa, and later Vermont.

Steve went to high school in Sioux City, but received his degree in civil engineering from the University of Vermont. He was married in 1923 to a girl from Grafton, Vt. The following year he took his first job with the Fort Pitt Bridge Works of Pittsburgh, Pa., making shop drawings and layout on a \$5 million bridge being built across the Monongahela River.

This was only the beginning of many years of work connected with bridge building. For 2 years he was with the bridge department of the New York Central Railroad in Cleveland, Ohio, where he worked on the design of several railroad bridges. He then spent 5 years with the Cincinnati Union Terminal Co. as one of the principal bridge designers of a \$43 million project to bring seven railroads into a new high-level terminal area. A half-mile-long conveyor bridge from Baton Rouge to the Mississippi River and a long-span \$6 million highway viaduct for the city of Cincinnati were two other projects with which he was associated before joining the Canal.

His first job in the Canal Zone was with the former office engineers, but much of his time was spent on bridge work and civil engineering. For 5 years he was in direct charge of both the design and inspection of wartime projects totaling \$40 million.

Except for a short break in his service in 1945, Steve has been with the canal organization for the past quarter century. For 9 years, prior to his appointment as resident engineer for the bridge project, he was chief of the structural branch. During this period, he spent at least 3 years on the design, inspection, and studies of both existing and proposed bridges. He designed the Gatun locks swing bridge and made the cost estimate for the bridge at Balboa, on which the appropriation was based. With most of the work under contract, that original estimate still holds.

Although the Gatun locks bridge was considerably smaller than many of the bridge contracts with which he has been associated, Steve is justifiably proud of this part of his bridge career because of the special engineering difficulties which it entailed.

He also is proud of a letter he received from Col. Craig Smyser, former engineering and construction bureau director, who stated his sincere appreciation for Steve's, "fine engineering analysis and detailed design."

Colonel Smyser expressed what is probably the lament of all civil engineers when he said that he was sure Steve had long since sadly realized that the engineer or architect is generally forgotten in hailing the accomplishments of the builder. "No one knows," he said, "the undoubtedly poor civil engineer who worked out the details for Xerxes' Bridge across the Hellespont and Colonel Goethals is honored more for the completion of the Panama Canal than the design."

This month the last of the six water piers of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge was nearing completion and the substructure work was coming to an end. Superstructure work was on schedule, and, except for contracts for the approach paving which are due to be awarded

in October, the end of the bridge construction in late 1962 was in sight.

Also in sight was the end of Elmer B. Stevens' career with the canal enterprise. The job as resident engineer for the bridge project probably will be the last he will hold with the organization. Steve hopes to retire sometime in 1963 and after that may spend some time gossiping with Indians from the upper Bayano region of the Darien, with whom he has been on good terms for many years, having made a number of trips into the area to visit with them. He also hopes to continue his engineering career, although on somewhat less strenuous schedule.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY AND THE MINUTEMEN

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a speech by Mr. SHELLEY.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring our colleagues' attention to an excellent address, delivered by my good friend, the distinguished Congressman from San Francisco, Calif., JACK SHELLEY, at the 81st annual alumni banquet of the University of San Francisco.

In the course of his remarks Congressman SHELLEY alerts Americans to the dangers posed to our country by extreme rightist groups such as the John Birch Society and the Minutemen, as well as the threat of infiltration by international communism.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, I would like to note Congressman SHELLEY's statement that extreme rightist members become "more despicable by their hysterical attacks on the loyalty of that great American, Chief Justice Earl Warren." They, Congressman SHELLEY points out, like the elements on the radical left, try to hide truth behind clouds of irresponsibility and a storm of hate and malice.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Congressman SHELLEY's observations call for serious reflection on our part, and I commend them to our colleagues' attention:

How do I say it? How can I express the honor I feel to be here—to be selected to address all of you tonight? I am deeply moved, and tremendously happy to be home again at the University of San Francisco.

It's always a great night when the grand guys who were lucky enough to attend the University of San Francisco get together. There are always a million stories, a lot of them mine, all starting: "Do you remember the time when * * *?"

The snapshots come out of the wallets and we get a look at the kids that were born, the cars that were bought, and the fish that were caught since we last got together.

And I don't want to take the spotlight away from all the new kids and grandchildren and exaggerated fish stories. Truly, I could reminisce for hours about the old days—some of the old football stories—particularly, when I see so many of my old teammates and classmates here tonight.

But just for these few minutes, let's remember, really, why we're here tonight. We're here to salute the great institution from which we got our starts—the University of San Francisco.

And don't worry. I'm not going to make a lecture out of this. What I want to do—just as simply as I can—is to express my own thoughts, the thoughts of one member of the law class of 1932, to the university that I love, with a sincere hope—a knowledge, that I speak for all of you, too.

It would be easy to make a long list of reasons why each of us is indebted to the University of San Francisco.

We all know that the great educators have written shelves full of books on the proper role of a university. Personally I feel that most of the best of them were writing about what I have seen the University of San Francisco stand for and do over a period of many years.

The faculty of my day—Fathers Flynn, Buckley, Carroll, Feeley, Corkery, Kavanaugh, Malone, White, Moots, and the two Fathers Whelan; Bill Breen, Bill Sweigert, Harold Caulfield, Charlie Knight, and Joe Farry (the rule in Shelley's case) and the late Jim Harrington and Ben McKinley—Ed Kell (the first time I heard "Harvard" pronounced "Hah-vahd"). In the last 2 years I have become very accustomed to this pronunciation, in fact, catch myself using it.

The faculty of U.S.F. in my day made it clear—and the faculty today still makes it clear—that education is a tool, or possibly a divining rod, to be used in a lifelong search.

And what we are looking for is what a reporter would call the facts, what a lawyer would call the evidence and what a philosopher would call the truth.

To my mind, this is the role of a university. In teaching the facts, the technique, and the procedures by which professional and non-professional men and women earn their livelihoods, a university must instill a kind of disciplined thinking.

It is this discipline that enables the student, years later, when his hair has thinned and turned gray, to continue to scrutinize, to judge carefully, and to evaluate accurately.

Whenever I find myself confronted with a complicated or confused problem, I make a serious effort to apply what I learned while at U.S.F.: to return to the fundamentals involved in the facts of the problem. As a young man in the labor movement, I was often told by Michael Casey, the real founder of the San Francisco labor movement, "Jack, my boy, when the sledding becomes rough, reduce the problem to fundamentals, and you will find the right answer."

This advice, in itself, was an application of what the good fathers tried to teach us, and are trying to teach today.

This discipline that a great university instills—a university such as the University of San Francisco—is directed toward making it possible for the graduate to more easily recognize falsehood; to more readily find the truth.

This has been the function of the university we salute tonight since 1855, when four Italian-born Jesuit Fathers opened the doors to St. Ignatius College downtown on Market Street.

Sure, they were Italian-born Jesuits—the Irish didn't have a corner on the Jesuit order in those days.

That was more than a century ago. And for all that time the Jesuit Fathers in San Francisco have worked tirelessly to prepare young San Franciscans, young Americans, for their adult roles, in a world rocked by titanic forces: America's bloody Civil War; the birth of Marxism; World War I; the start and collapse of the League of Nations; the great depression; the scourge of fascism and nazism; the horrors of World War II; the founding of the United Nations; and the challenge from communism.

With these as the background of her first century, the University of San Francisco has continued to contribute men of character and devotion to the public service, the learned professions, and the arts. Her sons have been trained to give leadership and balance to every community in which they work and live. After the training, the rest is up to each man individually as to what he makes of it.

August 15

appearing before congressional committees, representing consumers before the regulatory agencies, recommending legislation to the President, commenting on legislative proposals referred to the executive branch for reports, publicizing the need for consumer protection efforts, and coordinating with other countries' programs to aid consumers.

As matters now stand, there is no agency of government which speaks for the consumer. Likewise, there are no lobbies in Washington which can or do represent the wide range of consumer interests. Almost every conceivable industry and organization is represented; but the biggest group of all, the great body of American consumers, is left out of the picture.

There is nothing so aggravating and annoying as the petty frauds perpetrated on the public by people who make a business of deception and chicanery. Many of the people who are taken in by these gimmicks are people who can ill afford to sustain such losses. They are often people whose knowledge of the language is limited, and who are therefore easy victims of these unethical practitioners. Although many of these practices are against the law, the people who have been victimized have nowhere to turn for assistance.

Mr. President, I want to make it absolutely clear that solid, upstanding businessmen in our country should be just as deeply concerned—and I am sure they are—about these practices as I am, for, more often than not, the unethical businessman is seeking to cut out someone who has a legitimate and honest business in the same field.

Mr. President, it is perhaps late in the legislative year for full consideration to be given this year to my bill to set up a Consumer Counsel. Recognizing this fact, I strongly urge that the Government Operations Committee of the Senate, to which my bill has been referred, schedule hearings early next year, at the latest, on this proposal and on related proposals to aid consumers. The consumer is the forgotten man of America. It is about time something was done in the Government, so that, without creating a huge bureaucracy, some reasonable way can be found in which consumers can bring their problems to the attention of the proper agencies here in Washington.

Several days ago the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle ran an editorial supporting my proposal for the establishment of an Office of Consumer Counsel in the White House. This editorial makes a number of good points. I welcome the fine support of the Democrat and Chronicle, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE, THE CONSUMERS

There has always been this paradox in American politics on the Federal level—the mightiest class of spenders in America, those who literally keep the Nation solvent, have no dependable lobby working for them at all, whereas the National Capital is flooded with lobbies promoting everything else from the

cause of labor to the peanut crop. This mighty spending force is, of course, simply the consumer himself, multiplied millions of times.

Political historians have noted that the consumer does not seem to have complete protection from fraud, nor the compelling voice which he ought to have when the problems of management and labor and inflation and other things are taken up. Of course, the theoretical answer to this is that Congress itself is supposed to be the great lobby for the consumer—but it doesn't work out that way in many cases.

With this in mind, there is reason for support of Senator KEATING's bill to establish an Office of Consumer Counsel. He points out that the problems of the consumer are "manifold and complex"—and this is an understatement. The Senator also points out that millions of dollars are wasted when consumers are deceived by the unscrupulous; more millions are wasted by fraud; and these wastes represent economic harm to labor.

An Office of Consumer Counsel, as Senator KEATING envisions it, would appear at any proceeding, hearing, or investigation of any agency of the executive branch, to represent the consuming public. It would maintain liaison with main agencies affecting the general consumer interest; it would be linked with State consumer counsels and would cooperate with the Department of State in studying and developing relationships with consumer organizations of other nations.

Mr. KEATING's record is such that we know full well he has no idea of jamming up the private enterprise mechanism of the country, with its competitive elements. He knows the value of our way of life. Only a couple of weeks ago he introduced a program to curb inflation, one element of which was a nationwide drive to expand sales and stimulate economic activity.

So we can be confident in this matter of a consumer counsel that Senator KEATING has in mind something which has been pathetically needed many times in the past—a voice to speak strongly for the consumer, when he is caught in all of the squeezes which are created by special interests in Washington.

WHO SPEAKS FOR PROFIT?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, one of the great needs in our society are more people who can speak with conviction and eloquence to represent freemen's point of view. Mr. E. J. Hanley, president of Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., recently addressed the Association of Industrial Advertisers, on the subject, "Who Speaks for Profit?" He identifies profit as the real force that keeps the world of free enterprise moving and he presents the case so convincingly that I commend it to the attention of Members of both Senate and House.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO SPEAKS FOR PROFIT?

(Keynote address by E. J. Hanley, president, Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., at the annual conference of the Association of Industrial Advertisers, Boston, June 12, 1961)

I am delighted to be with you in Boston, this city of history which has meant so much over the years to our people and to the course of the Republic—from the American Revolution to the development of radar at MIT in World War II. As a transplanted Bostonian, I find it a constant pleasure and an inspiration to return here and I want to thank you for the opportunity you have

given me to spend a few hours in Boston and to speak before your group today.

Almost every schoolboy learns the old phrase, "One if by land, and two if by sea." I learned it well, too, and listened to it continually as I drove a sightseeing bus around this town some 40 years ago and slowed down in front of Old North Church. You will remember that the old watchword meant that one lantern would be lighted in the church belfry if the British forces were to attack the colonists by land and two if the invaders were to come by sea. It was a highly effective, dramatic, and I am sure inspirational message in that historic day.

I find it to have been a considerable cut above one of the slogans that assails us today: "L. & M. has found the secret." I am happy indeed that L. & M. has found a secret, whatever it may be, but I seriously wonder why the creative people in our advertising profession haven't come up with a 1961 version of the Old North Church watchword to guide us through the economic and political shoals in these perilous times; times as perilous, I submit, as that day when the red coats shone in the sun on Concord Bridge.

I would hesitate to offer "One if by Moscow, two by Peiping" as a candidate, but then I am not an advertising writer. I am sure everyone in this room could do much better.

We are all aware, I am certain, that our world has changed swiftly; our national pace quickens; and our people are torn by misgivings about their strength, their greatness, and their destiny. Individuals of eminence in our economic, political, and social life are voicing their concern about America's position in the world, about our economic situation, and about the various and sundry ills that afflict us as a nation.

Last fall, in discussing the importance of regaining a favorable balance of payments for the United States, Dr. Gabriel Hauge, chairman of the finance committee of the Manufacturers Trust Co. of New York and a noted economist, pictured the following disastrous consequence of America's loss as a leader of world trade:

"If we lose our trading position and the dollar declines as an international reserve currency, foreigners will tend to cash their dollar claims; gold will tend to flow out, and we will be forced to curtail our vital oversea military and economic commitments. The mark, the pound, yes, even the ruble, may take the place of the dollar; and other nations will fill the vacuum in our oversea military and economic undertakings. The dollar is in constant competition with other strong currencies. In the economic world, it is the strong that prevail."

BURNS GIVES DRAMATIC WARNING

Three weeks ago at the annual meeting of the American Iron and Steel Institute in New York, Dr. Arthur Burns, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers in the Eisenhower administration, after pointing out that devaluation of the dollar is a probable consequence of a continuing unfavorable balance of payments, said about the same thing, perhaps even more dramatically, in these words:

"No one can foresee all the consequences that would flow from a devaluation of the dollar, if events ever took this fateful turn, but it may nevertheless be salutary to visualize them. A devaluation would at once increase the purchasing power of Russia's gold in world markets. It would in time raise our domestic price level. It would impair, if not destroy, confidence in the dollar as an international reserve currency. It would be promptly followed by devaluation in other countries, probably in many of them. It would be attended by widespread economic unsettlement in our country and abroad. It could initiate a new era of competitive depreciation of national currencies. It might serve to regenerate exchange controls

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

14811

Mr. President, this is the very worst approach to take with students on any college campus, which is an area which encourages inquiry into ideas and the search for truth. It is bad enough for any organization to encourage, by the offering of prizes, attacks on one of the three branches of our Government; but it is especially subject to condemnation when such prizes are offered to students, in an endeavor to encourage them to prejudge a case, thus asking our young people, who should be developing inquiring minds, to close their minds and to pass judgment on a question of that sort. Certainly such an undertaking would seem to lay bare the insidious nature and the dangerous blind spot in the Birch group.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Roscoe Drummond be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE \$2,300 JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The attack by the John Birch Society on the U.S. Supreme Court and its effort to vilify Chief Justice Earl Warren may well impair the John Birch Society more than it does the Court.

The Birch Society claims to be a thoroughly and sincerely conservative organization whose purpose is to alert the country to the dangers of communism. That is a useful and proper thing to do. But when the leader of this organization resorts to extreme, radical, and reckless methods which have the effect of harming those very institutions he says he wants to secure, then the Birch Society is throwing away its credentials.

Its latest action, announced by Robert H. Welch, Jr., is to invite college students to compete for \$2,300 by writing essays on grounds for the impeachment of Chief Justice Warren.

Obviously, every decision by every Justice of the Court is subject to the most searching debate and dissent by anybody. But when the Birch Society proceeds to the proposition that if we don't like the decisions of a member of the Court, he should be removed, this is not supporting a government of law. It is throwing it away.

I doubt if the American people have so soon forgotten F.D.R.'s ill-conceived and similar Court-packing plan of 1937. Roosevelt, too, didn't like some of the decisions of the Court in the midthirties and he proposed to add nine more Justices to the High Bench in order to outvote those who were making what to him were the wrong decisions. Even President Roosevelt, powerful and popular as he was, did not dare to suggest the impeachment of the Chief Justice or other members of the Court. He just proposed to outnumber them. His proposal was roundly defeated by the Senate.

The president of the American Bar Association, Whitney N. Seymour, has described the Birch Society bid to get students to write essays on why the Chief Justice should be impeached as not legitimate criticism of decisions.

"No responsible person will encourage it," he said. "The ignorant, by such false implication of misconduct, are led into disrespect for our institutions which maintain liberty under law, and thus for all law. Let us leave such attacks to the Communists, who hate our institutions. Our duty is to uphold and defend liberty and the independent courts which are essential to maintain it."

The head of the Birch Society says that the purpose of the essay contest against

Justice Warren is "to stir up a great deal of interest among conservatives on the campuses on the dangers that face this country."

You will note that Welch does not invite the college students to examine the grounds "for and against" impeachment. He asks them to examine only the grounds "for" impeachment and write their essays to that end.

I wonder if this kind of one-sided research and be-sure-to-come-up-with-the-right-opinion approach will appeal to many students of law and government. I wonder if there may not be students who will enter the contest with essays suggesting that there are no grounds for the impeachment of the Chief Justice. There will certainly be those who will conclude that packing the Court because you do not like some of its decisions is not government by law but nullification by law.

Welch is subtle. He does not exactly and openly say that Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower is pro-Communist. He merely circulates a letter which suggests that he has aided the Communists and invites your opinion.

Welch does not say that the Chief Justice should be impeached or that there are grounds for his impeachment. He invites others to do so and offers \$2,300 in prizes to those who do it best.

This does not seem to me to be either an honest or an honorable thing to do. It is this kind of thing which is hurting anticommunism, rather than helping it.

approaches to bargaining power; (1) encouragement of effectively organized lamb marketing associations; (2) investigation by the industry, without Government help, of the possibility of marketing orders; (3) consideration of integration in the industry, with the producers serving as the integrators; (4) approval of recent investigations of chain-store buying practices by the packers and stockyards administration and necessary followup action.

Lamb supply and merchandising: (1) Removal of the decree which restricts larger slaughterers of lamb from retailing their products; (2) cooperation of packers with the American Sheep Producers Council in supplying lamb to deficit lamb-consuming areas to give merchandising support to the council's promotion; (3) formation of an industrywide committee to discuss lamb imports and mutual problems with representatives of foreign nations that import lamb into the United States; (4) organization of an industrywide committee to work with packers and distributors to work on lamb merchandising problems; (5) correlation of all lamb production and carcass evaluation which would lead to development of a lamb carcass with greater consumer acceptance; (6) need for additional program with producers to halt marketing of heavy lambs which depress the price of lighter weight consumer-preferred lambs; (7) thorough study of marketing and distribution to avoid periods of oversupply.

Incentive to quality: (1) Research by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and State experiment stations to develop a dual lamb grading system which reflects difference in yield of retail cuts; (2) speeding up of present research and needed new research to produce lambs with greater public acceptance; (3) expansion of research on factors which will speed up improvement in lamb quality; (4) immediate action by the National Wool Growers Association and other conference sponsors to establish a research foundation to speed up present research and start new research at existing institutions; (5) separation of lambs and sheep, and lamb meat and mutton in USDA reports; (6) investigation of ways of reducing cause for condemnation of mutton carcasses; (7) study of factors affecting public-acceptance of mutton and economic desirability of producing grade mutton; (8) focusing next national conference on incentives to improve lamb and mutton desirability.

How can domestic wool meet competition? (1) Research to learn the least amount of synthetic fibers required in wool blends to give best performance and investigation of wool blends and all new synthetics coming onto the market; (2) development of new processes to give wool "even more desirable" qualities and provision for conducting new processes on a large industrial scale; (3) organization of growers to provide more direct influence on wool preparation and marketing.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A CONSUMER COUNSEL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on July 27 I introduced in the Senate a bill to establish, here in Washington, an official Consumer Counsel in the White House, to represent consumers.

To the best of my knowledge, this is the first bill introduced in the Congress spelling out in detail the major functions and objectives of a White House Consumer Counsel. While it is entirely possible for the President to set up such an office by Executive order, I think this bill is both constructive and useful, in that it suggests what the Consumer Counsel would do in such key areas as

RESOLUTIONS ON THE WOOL INDUSTRY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, a group of specialists has been meeting on the campus of the University of Wyoming, to explore many of the facets of the wool industry in the United States and to deal with many of the complications and developments in the textile industry and in the realm of imports, and the like. As a result, in the course of its deliberations of several days, the group has arrived at a series of conclusions and recommendations. It has passed these on to national leaders of its organization. Because the burden of the recommendations is such that I believe it would be helpful and provocative to the Members of the Senate to see them, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions of advice and direction be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOOLMEN'S HAND 22 · RECOMMENDATIONS TO NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION

Wool and lamb industry people charged the National Wool Growers Association with responsibility for obtaining industrywide cooperation in carrying out recommendations from the National Lamb and Wool Industry Conference August 7-8 at the University of Wyoming.

The action by about 150 participants came in the final session of the conference after a day of open discussion in 4 workshop groups. They attended from 26 States, Australia, and Afghanistan to meet under the theme "Income Improvement."

Twenty-two recommendations and suggestions adopted centered on cooperation in study, planning, and action among groups within the industry. Included was a proposal for an American industrywide committee to meet with representatives of foreign nations importing lamb into the United States.

Recommendations and suggestions under the four discussion headings included: New

1961

After the end of the Korean conflict the supply mission at the Clearfield Naval Base declined rapidly, and in order to utilize the facilities at this base a number of warehouses and other buildings which were excess to the needs of the Government were leased to private companies for commercial activities.

This practice of the Government in leasing land, buildings, and other facilities for commercial purposes has created serious tax problems for the State of Utah. A number of companies have availed themselves of these excellent buildings at a fair rental rate from the Government, and then received an unexpected windfall because they have not had to pay State taxes on equipment and inventories located on this naval establishment. In some instances, some of these companies have recognized a moral, although not a legal obligation, to pay taxes to the State of Utah, and in some prior years willingly paid such taxes assessed by the State.

However, the Federal Government has created a situation which has dried up even this source of voluntary tax revenue. Both the Treasury and the Defense Departments have raised a question as to the legality of such companies paying these taxes, inasmuch as such payments are voluntary and not mandatory. The Defense Department has raised the question in regard to cost-plus contracts and has denied such voluntary tax payments as a necessary item of cost in arriving at the contractual amount to which a contractor might be entitled for services or goods produced for the Government. Likewise, the Treasury has denied these companies permission to take such voluntary payments as a legal deduction on their Federal tax returns.

Consequently, it can be readily seen that Utah faces a real dilemma in that it does not have the necessary legal authority to assess and collect taxes against these companies. And now, it is denied any hope of obtaining voluntary compliance with tax assessments against these companies who lease facilities on the Clearfield Naval Base, inasmuch as the United States has exclusive jurisdiction.

Moreover, companies which have been able to obtain leases of buildings at the Clearfield Naval Supply Depot are given a distinct competitive advantage over other businesses which must pay State taxes.

Therefore, an urgent need exists to approve the bill I introduce so that agreements might be worked out between the Federal and State Governments to restore to Utah concurrent jurisdiction over the lands in question, so that the State might have the proper authority to levy and collect the taxes to which it is rightfully entitled.

Since the language in this bill is permissive and not mandatory, the Navy could exercise the discretionary power provided in this bill and retain exclusive jurisdiction over certain lands or buildings, where for security or other reasons it felt that concurrent jurisdiction would not be in the national interest.

Mr. President, there is good precedent for enactment of the bill which I intro-

duce. Only yesterday, the Senate passed and sent to the President H.R. 7721, which authorized the Secretary of the Army to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over Fort Sheridan, Ill. The only difference in language between H.R. 7721 and my bill is that the former applied to an Army installation while mine relates to a naval depot.

It is therefore my hope, Mr. President, that the Armed Services Committee will give immediate consideration to this bill, especially in view of the fact that the Clearfield Naval Supply Depot is scheduled to be deactivated by July 1964, and during the next 3 years undoubtedly more and more of these facilities will be leased to private companies with a resulting loss of taxes to both the State and local governments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2421) to provide for retrocession of legislative jurisdiction over U.S. Naval Supply Depot Clearfield, Ogden, Utah, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the appointment of a representative of the United States to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and to make other provisions with respect to the participation of the United States in that Organization, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State, dated July 31, 1961, to the Vice President in regard to it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2423) to provide for the appointment of a representative of the United States to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this

Act may be cited as the "Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development Act of 1961."

Sec. 2. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may appoint a permanent representative of the United States to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Organization"), who shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such representative shall be the representative of the United States to the Organization and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the Organization as the President may from time to time direct.

(b) The President may appoint or designate an alternate permanent representative of the United States to the Organization to serve during the absence, illness, or other disability of the permanent representative provided for in subsection (a) of this section or in the event of a vacancy in that office. The President may also appoint or designate from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the bodies of the Organization.

(c) Persons nominated by the President and elected to chair any committee or other body of the Organization shall receive compensation at rates determined by the President upon the basis of duties to be performed but not in excess of rates authorized by sections 411 and 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 866, 867), for chiefs of missions and Foreign Service officers occupying positions of equivalent importance. Any such persons may be granted allowances and benefits not to exceed those received by chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers occupying positions of equivalent importance. If a Foreign Service officer shall be nominated by the President to serve under this subsection, the period of his service shall be considered as constituting an assignment for duty within the meaning of section 571 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and such person shall not, by virtue of such service, lose his status as a Foreign Service officer.

(d) All persons appointed or designated in pursuance of authority contained in subsection (a) and (b) of this section shall receive compensation at rates determined by the President upon the basis of duties to be performed but not in excess of rates authorized by sections 411 and 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 866, 867), for chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers occupying positions of equivalent importance, except that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated under subsection (b) of this section as a representative of the United States in the bodies of the Organization shall be entitled to receive such compensation. Any person who receives compensation pursuant to the provisions of this subsection may be granted allowances and benefits not to exceed those received by chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers occupying positions of equivalent importance.

Sec. 3. The representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, when representing the United States in the Organization, shall, at all times, act in accordance with the instructions of the President transmitted by the Secretary of State unless other means of transmission are directed by the President.

Sec. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization, and for all necessary salaries and expenses of the permanent representative, other representatives and persons provided for in section 2 hereof, and of their

appropriate staffs, including personal services without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1933, as amended; salaries as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and allowances and benefits of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); translating and other services, by contract; hire and purchase (not to exceed two, the cost of which shall not exceed \$7,800 each) of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111); official functions and courtesies; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State.

SEC. 5. The salaries, expenses, and allowances of any employees of the United States Government detailed to serve with the Organization which are payable by the Organization may be credited against the payment by the United States Government of its share of the expenses of the Organization.

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

AUGUST 8, 1961.
The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR Mr. VICE PRESIDENT: There is attached a bill designed to permit the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Permanent Representative of the United States to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The bill also provides authorization for the salaries and administrative facilities for the representative and his staff.

The ratification process of the OECD was completed by the United States March 23, 1961. We expect that the appropriate number of other signatories will ratify in the near future so that the convention will come into force this fall. In order that we may be appropriately prepared and represented for this event, we are therefore requesting that legislation be enacted by the Congress establishing the position of a U.S. representative to the OECD.

The activities of this organization are of the greatest importance to the economic welfare of the United States and the member countries of the OECD. We intend to make the fullest possible use of this organization and to participate actively in its functions. Our role will not only be motivated by consideration of our well being, and that of our friends, but also because of our position of leadership in creating this new union of collective action in the economic field. As we provided a great deal of initiative in the creation of the OECD, and as we resolutely supported the need for it during the long months of negotiation, other members will expect that we be represented by a well-grounded representative whose position is established by congressional legislation. Anything less than this would not be fully in consonance with the weight of importance which we attach to the OECD for strengthening the ties between North America and Western Europe and as a major mechanism for economic cooperation.

As the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate has pointed out in their Report on the Convention, this is a time of sweeping political, social, and technological change in which strictly bilateral efforts are not always sufficient to meet the demands of events. Able representation in certain permanent multilateral organizations is at least as much a desideratum in carrying on our international relationships as is our representation through embassies abroad. We

have in the past recognized this, as in the case of our representation in the United Nations and in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

A review of the position of our Government in these times shows that we are now one of the leading members of a new, promising economic organization which has advanced beyond the older, more limited European regional concepts. We have undertaken with other friendly nations, in the self-interest of all of us, to promote our economic growth, to contribute in a coordinated fashion to economic expansion in less-developed countries and to deal with the broad outlines of trade policy affecting the development of world trade. In order, therefore, for us to achieve the maximum benefits from our participation in this organization, we should properly be represented in the OECD.

It is my earnest and urgent recommendation that the legislative action required to establish the position of U.S. Representative to the OECD and to provide for his staff be completed at the earliest convenient date. Representatives of the Department of State would of course be prepared to discuss these matters with the appropriate committee of the Senate at any time.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that the draft bill would be consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

DEDUCTION FOR INCOME-TAX PURPOSES OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 2244) relating to the deduction for income-tax purposes of contributions to charitable organizations whose sole purpose is making distribution to other charitable organizations, contributions to which, by individuals, are deductible within the 30-percent limitation of adjusted gross income, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF SCHOOLS IN FEDERALLY IMPACTED AREAS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2393) to extend for 1 year the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874 relating to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in federally impacted areas, and to provide for the application of such laws to American Samoa, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENTS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 8, 1961, the names of Senators MUNDT, FONG, TOWER, CARLSON, MILLER, THURMOND, YOUNG of North Dakota, CASE of South Dakota, BUTLER, CAPEHART, BEALL, BRIDGES, HOLLAND, BENNETT, and DODD were added as additional cosponsors of the amendments submitted

on August 8, 1961, by Mr. GOLDWATER, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2345) to extend and improve the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Rex B. Hawks, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. marshal, western district of Oklahoma, for a term of 4 years, vice Kenner W. Greer.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, August 22, 1961, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address by him over radio station WGN, Chicago, recently.

By Mr. CARROLL:

Excerpts from address delivered by Senator KEFAUVER before the 14th Regional 4-H Club Conference, Washington, D.C., on August 11, 1961.

Resolution adopted by the City Council of Aurora, Colo., relating to the development and conservation of water resources.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Address delivered by Maurice R. Franks, president of the National Labor-Management Foundation, before Chicago Rotary Club No. 1, Chicago, Ill., August 8, 1961.

By Mr. GRUENING:

Article on Harriet Pullen, of Skagway, Alaska, written by Herbert Hilscher and published in Reader's Digest for August 1961.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Editorial entitled "President Signs Federal Pollution Control Bill," published in Texas Water, July 1961 issue.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

Article entitled "Lincoln, Nebr.: The Lilac City," published in the September issue of Senior Citizen.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Letter from Vice President JOHNSON to President Robert Six, of Continental Airlines, concerning El Paso plane incident.

DANGER OF THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in the Outlook section of the Washington Post for Sunday, August 13, appeared an article entitled "The \$2,300 Birch Society." In the article, Roscoe Drummond rightfully takes to task the John Birchers for offering prizes to students on the college campuses of our country for stating why the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States ought to be impeached.

August 17

this material. I know he has gone into it very thoroughly. He has brought facts to the House that should have been brought out some time ago. I know that he has worked diligently for an investigation of this matter and I certainly hope that his efforts will not be in vain. I want to add that I urge personally that those officials whom he has requested to take charge of this investigation read his remarks and give this general hearing that he deserves.

Mr. DEVINE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

THE BONDS OF CUSTOM

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

(Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, in an age of speed, behavior follows stimulus unhesitatingly. The rapid succession of events impels immediate reaction, whether rational or irrational. There seems to be no time for the calm assessment of consequences and the adaptation of action to permanent principles and policies. In the helter-skelter of the moment, the need for improvisation seems compelling. We go on from one act to the next with no clear sight of the ultimate end of it all. In seeking a nebulous future we ignore the plain precepts of history, which admonish that the essential nature of man does not change over night. "The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done," said the Preacher more than 2,500 years ago. Shall we be amazed and confounded when the cumulative effect of our innovations leaves that part of the world in which we act in still greater confusion, then? To expect any other result is the vain dream of a political amateur. And in the field of foreign influence, the United States is a rank amateur.

The position of world leadership supposedly thrust on us by developments over the last 50 years is an anomalous one. And in the rush and hurry of seizing what seems to be both an opportunity and a responsibility, we have not taken time out to set a realistic goal for the sum of our efforts, nor made an accurate measure of our capabilities to achieve that goal. In some vague sort of way, we take it for granted that if we act wisely and quickly we can lift a large portion of the globe from despotism, misery, ignorance and poverty in a generation or less. And we have persuaded many that this is not only our intention but our duty.

The address of the President of Pakistan before the joint session of Congress recently is evidence of this. The expedi-

ents which we expect to employ—and which we are expected to employ—are large grants of money and technical assistance. These constitute an irresistible force to put the world to rights. Unfortunately, they are directed against an immovable object of centuries of habit and custom. What does history teach is the result of such an encounter?

Some two centuries ago the Frenchman, Montesquieu, after 20 years of research and contemplation, produced a work which is still a monument to his genius and power of analysis. He called it the spirit of laws, and in it he endeavored to trace the motives and causes for the various forms of social organization, despotic, monarchical, or republican, established over the earth during the course of recorded time:

Mankind are influenced by various causes; by the climate, by the religion, by the laws, by the maxims of government, by precedents, morals, and customs; whence is formed a general spirit of nations.

Of these influences, the last named are the most difficult to change. They determine the character of the several nations, whether vicious or virtuous. The form which the government actually assumes in any nation is fixed inevitably—perhaps immutably—by the character of the people:

Solon being asked if the laws he had given to the Athenians were the best, he replied, "I have given them the best they were able to bear."

Of the influences named above, Montesquieu was inclined to think that geography and climate were the determining factors in the formation of habits and customs. Especially in the torrid zones, the debilitating effects of heat produce a physical and mental lassitude hostile to the kind of effort that is necessary to preserve a people from despotism. But in temperate climes he found too many exceptions to admit of a general rule:

Jornadez the Goth called the north of Europe the forge of the human race. I should rather call it the forge where those weapons were framed which broke the chains of southern nations. In the North were formed those valiant people who sallied forth and deserted their countries to destroy tyrants and slaves, and to teach men that, nature having made them equal, reason could not render them dependent, except where it was necessary to their happiness.

Whatever may be the actual causes of differences between various groups of the human race, it is evident that differences exist. They have increased in significance through a long drawn out process which we call a civilizing process. Where the differences are the most pronounced the people have achieved a standard of living relatively free from hunger, disease, and oppression by tyrants. This standard has been achieved only through the expenditure of untold effort and thought. The less developed peoples now ask for the same standard as a free gift. Yet they say, with Montesquieu, "Let them leave us as we are; our indiscretions joined to our good nature would make the laws which should constrain our sociability, that is, which would compel us to act differently—not at all proper for us." This is practically

what the President of Pakistan said in explaining the circumstances under which his government finds itself immersed in a sea of troubles, political and economic.

The position of world leadership into which the United States has been thrust following the last world war is due more to its economic strength than its military strength. This is something totally new in world history. Previously, economic strength in a nation has followed rather than preceded military success. The victorious state aggrandized its economic power by seizing the resources and the productive capacities of the conquered peoples. The United States developed its vast productive output internally. Many reasons have been given for our preeminence in this respect, with the accent generally placed on the extensive natural resources of a single nation spread over half a continent. Too little importance has been attached to the genius and the industry of our people. To put it plainly, the United States has grown rich and powerful because we have devoted practically our entire energy to the accumulation of wealth. In other words, our customs and our habits, more importantly than our resources and our laws, conduce to an overwhelming extent and variety of production. In the matter of domination, we are without experience. We scarcely dominate ourselves, let alone other peoples.

So, in our new position of world leadership, we are ignorant of any suitable procedure except to raise the living standards of the rest of the world to something approximating our own level. It is assumed that if we can do this, we will remove the cause of tensions and avert tendencies toward destructive conflicts. It is not necessary to argue here that much of world unrest is due to poverty. Granting that, it is still not clear that if every nation in the world were as strong economically as we are, there would be no more wars. People would find something else to fight about. They always have. Nevertheless, poverty is deplorable in its own right. The sensibilities of the American people are shocked at the thought of starvation in areas where there might, under proper conditions, be plenty. Our instinctive humanity urges us to alleviate that tragedy, if we can.

It is fair to assume that the foreign policy of the United States, so far as it is explicit and coherent at all, is activated by a desire to dispel poverty, disease, misery and despotism everywhere. Let us consider what we are up against.

A recent pamphlet issued by the State Department estimates that two-thirds of the world suffers from hunger. The United States has 6 percent of the world's population. That is, for every individual in the United States, there are 11 individuals elsewhere who need help. The present productive output, measured in terms of American dollars, in these unfortunate underdeveloped lands is an average of \$130 per capita. In the United States it is \$2,700, more than 20 times as high. How can such a multitude of people scale the

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

15181

to call attention to this very great miscarriage of justice in branding a man guilty of something before he even had an investigation or a trial. Then, the worst crime of all, it would seem to any intelligent individual knowledgeable in this field, of this distinguished combat general, was that he was a patriot.

The issue of civilian control over the military again has been raised in this Congress. The principle of military subordination to civilian control has been extended by some to include activities which seem to involve matters of conscience.

There has been a prominent Member of Congress who has called attention to the fact that we need to have civilian control of the military. If the gentleman from Ohio would permit me to inject this, I would like to point out that it was civilian control that precipitated the action of the United States of America in Korea in the so-called police action. I would also like to point out that it was civilian control that precipitated the action of the use of Federal troops at Little Rock in violation of the Constitution of the United States, which resulted in the assignment of the very general officer against whom smear tactics have been used in this instance.

Anyone who knows General Walker personally—and I have had many letters from businessmen, military associates, officers who have served with him, and enlisted men who have served under his command—one such letter I placed in the Record because this young fellow directed his remarks to the whole problue program. He felt so keenly about this that in his letter to me he stated that he felt so keenly about General Walker's activities in this matter that he would do this despite any action that would be taken against him, including that of court-martial.

I say this is a very questionable affair. I commend the gentleman from Ohio on his resolution, and I hope that some real action will come of this.

Relative to the Overseas Weekly, which I did say on the floor of the House was a salacious publication, I would ask this question: Is it true that one of the individuals who is high in the management of the Overseas Weekly is also high up in the management of Radio Swan, that was so active in revealing the troops of the Cuban exiles who were invading Cuba recently. It is common knowledge here among some people, or the talk is common among Members of this House, that Radio Swan tipped off to the Castro forces the fact that these Cuban forces were going to invade the island. I ask the question, Is it true that one of the managers of this station, or part owners, is also one of the owners of the Overseas Weekly? If it be true, I would respectfully suggest to this House that it calls for a full-scale investigation.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have heard here all this week high-sounding phrases about combating international communism, and here is a distinguished combat officer, and the only crime he has committed is fighting international communism by informing his troops and their dependents. What

on earth goes on here in the land of the free and the home of the brave, if a man who has been decorated time and again for fighting the enemies of America has to be smeared and denied an assignment to which he was to be assigned. It was common knowledge he would probably have been assigned to a post that would have resulted in a third star on the shoulders of this brave officer.

In today's RECORD I have also submitted a copy of an article that was a part of this Communist International meeting in New York City in 1921, and they have not changed their policy, in which the Communist Party and the Communist International meeting in New York City in 1921 encouraged their Communist comrades in smearing or otherwise downgrading the military leadership of the countries in which they are working.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Ohio will permit me, as part of this discussion I would like to quote from a copy of a telegram to the President of the United States as follows:

TELEGRAM TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

As one who has personally visited the command of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, 24th Infantry Division, Augsburg, Germany, as recent as July 1960, and as one who has firsthand knowledge as to the orientation program instituted for the troops by General Walker on the aims and purposes of international communism, based on official directives and existing Army regulations, I wish to protest with all the vigor possible the filthy smear attempt of the salacious, privately owned publication called The Overseas Weekly, against one of America's greatest combat generals, Edwin A. Walker. Mrs. Bundy and I have been house guests of the general for 1 week at a time. We are thoroughly familiar with the security indoctrination program of the command. The Overseas Weekly is run by a group of questionable characters, some of whom have been engaged in activities which need to be exposed to the American public. If the time has come in the history of this Nation that a filthy publication, which deals in lurid sex appeals to members of the American Armed Forces, can successfully remove a great American general from his command, then it is time that we stop all attempts to combat the evil forces which are seeking to take us over. I will gladly appear under oath at any time to discuss the indoctrination program of the 24th Infantry Command which has no connection with the John Birch Society but rather is based on U.S. Government publications.

EDGAR C. BUNDY,
General Chairman, Church League of
America, Major, USAFR.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the hour is late, but on a matter as serious as this and on which there is so much discussion in the Congress relative to civilian control of the military, I would respectfully call the attention of the Members of this House to material that has been inserted in the RECORD in the past 2 days in particular relative to the position of the Communist Party in editorials appearing in the Communist Daily Worker of this country relative to this very subject. I submit to the membership of this House that it is a great paradox, indeed, when we debate all week on how

we are going to spend billions of dollars combating international communism and, yet, we see the end of the brilliant career of a great, dedicated American general whose only crime is love of country.

Mr. DEVINE. I thank the gentleman. The sinister implications, as revealed by the gentleman from Arkansas, again demand investigation be made into all aspects of this overall picture.

Again I say to my colleagues, there is always a great hue and cry for an investigation when someone is accused of being a little left of center or having questionable sympathies. But when a man stands up and fights for America and for patriotic constitutional government, we do not hear a peep out of these people who are usually do-gooders and bleeding hearts.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague. He is definitely right when he says we have legitimate questions that beg answers regarding the courtesy, and what I believe to be the outright injustice visited upon General Walker. As a chaplain on active duty in the Navy during World War II, and during the Korean police action and in the Racine Naval Reserve in Wisconsin, I gave lectures on character guidance and moral leadership training which included remarks about communism in the effort to help our young men to understand the true nature of the enemy.

I know from experience it is very difficult, because there are many roadblocks placed in one's path when one is trying to speak out against communism and for America. But be that as it may, I wish to add—and I add this as a warning—that if we Members of the House permit by default unjustified attacks upon the people we represent, or are silent partners with those we feel at least have authority to silence our great men—and I understand there are other citizens, thousands of them, who are presently being silenced, who happen to be working in various departments of our Government—how long will it be that we who share membership in this House will have the privilege of speaking the facts, to deny one the right to speak out for America and for freedom, perhaps all who desire to speak out for American freedom.

Mr. DEVINE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I would like again to invite the attention of the Members to the remarks of the junior Member from South Carolina of the other body which appeared in the RECORD of July 26, and several days thereafter, because he has done a tremendous research job on this whole matter.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. I would like to commend my colleague from Ohio. I know he has worked many many hours on acquiring

15180

cannot fully evaluate the effect this paper has on our young men. However, I can assure you that this is not literature parents desire that their sons read. Many dependent parents prohibit their children from reading this paper.

Nothing can be said for the program General Walker conducted in the _____ Division but that it was outstanding. It was established to instill patriotism in our soldiers and to show them who their enemy is and how he operates. Remember, "know your enemy!"

For this he was persecuted; he should have been praised.

Being a former FBI agent, you have probably heard J. Edgar Hoover say that any man in a high position who chooses to fight communism will be hurt. I no longer doubt the veracity of this. General Walker is not our only citizen who has been hurt.

Congratulations, sir, for standing up to be counted. It seems that everyone else is "running scared."

Sincerely yours,

This is signed by an officer.

Here is another quite short letter, dated the 6th of this month, again from an oversea post office number:

DEAR SIR. I have noted in the Stars and Stripes you have demanded a congressional hearing for General Walker.

He says further:

I think this whole deal just plain stinks. You are right in thinking that General Walker is muzzled and gagged so that he can say nothing. So is everyone else, and I do mean everyone.

And a blank day of a blank month:

I leave Germany on a certain ship for a certain port to receive my discharge shortly. I should get there about (blank) at which time (omit).

As soon as possible after that I would like to see you on this matter. I feel that I can be of help but at present I can say nothing.

I hope you will say nothing of this letter and will answer as soon as you can so I will be able to make my plans early.

I might say that I have corresponded further with him, however, not using the letterhead of the U.S. Congress.

I might also say that the junior Member of the other body from the State of South Carolina has pursued this matter from a different aspect. There is a great deal of information contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 26.

It tells a great deal about not only the General Walker situation itself but other aspects concerning the general muzzling of the military, and certain memorandums that was issued by another member of the other body which would indicate that the military service should not teach or promote anti-Communist films and discussions, the reason for which I find difficult to understand, and they refer to those that do stand up for patriotism as the "radical right."

A portion of the RECORD of July 26 says this, which I will quote. Relating to the general attack by Communists to discredit military leaders, it says:

Possibly the beginnings of the attack, other than in Pravda itself, was a slander sheet called the Overseas Weekly, which apparently has as its primary purpose the general discrediting of U.S. servicemen and their leadership in Europe, particularly those of the 24th Infantry Division. As a particular target, the Overseas Weekly undertook

a campaign against the anti-Communist indoctrination course of the 24th Division and its commander at that time, Maj. Gen. Edwin Walker.

It is significant that although the Overseas Weekly has been charged with being subversive by many persons that the only investigation has been directed at General Walker and not the vicious slander sheet which dances to the tune of leftwing causes and gives its most prominent display to "girly cheesecake" pictures and sensational GI crimes in its publication area, so near the Iron Curtain.

Despite the softly worded conclusions contained in the Department of Defense release on the General Walker incident, it is apparent that the campaign of the Overseas Weekly against the indoctrination program and General Walker was a great success for the Communists. Just how successful can be gleaned from a letter written by a company grade officer of the 24th Division to National Review and published in the May 6 issue of National Review.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to enlarge upon this much further at this time except to say this: It seems to me that the people of America are entitled to know the true facts concerning the release of General Walker from his command in Europe. As I say, I do not know the gentleman. I never heard of him before this particular incident. Maybe he is wrong. I do not think he is wrong. I am not going to prejudge him. But, I think we should know the facts, and that is why I have introduced this particular resolution requesting an impartial investigation.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. I want to commend my colleague from Ohio for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I think it is of sufficient import to have it brought to the attention of the House as a special order of business. Now, I have received quite a number of letters from interested constituents in my district who sought information, many of whom did not attempt to, as the gentleman from Ohio said, prejudge the matter. They did so, however, because the charges as outlined were somewhat vague and because the original charges were, in fact, found to be not true.

And because certain alleged associations subsequently were even denied in the report from the Department of the Army, I think that we owe it to General Walker, and for that matter to every man in the armed services, to a review in this case.

To the knowledge of the gentleman from Ohio a review of this case has not been granted by the Army; is that correct?

Mr. DEVINE. I have no information to that effect. All I know is based on newspaper accounts and my correspondence with the Department of Defense to the effect that he was relieved of his command prior to the investigation. The admonition was, as I understand it, verbal, which is of no significance in military circles, as a lesson to other persons in the military not to take this type of tack in connection with your program for your military personnel.

Mr. COLLIER. More detailed information on the charges which have been portrayed in a somewhat vague manner have been requested by certain Members of Congress, as I understand it?

Mr. DEVINE. That is correct.

Mr. COLLIER. What reason has been given, if the gentleman knows, for not revealing this detailed and specific information?

Mr. DEVINE. Well, according to the letter which I incorporated in the RECORD here from Chairman VINSON, it indicated that he had had access to some material from the Department of Defense which I believe he described as classified.

Mr. COLLIER. The precedent of reviewing information in the Department of the Army files has already been established, if my memory serves me correctly, in the now famous Harmon and Abramowitz cases. Here the Supreme Court reviewed the military files; and in those cases, as the gentleman will remember, ruled that these two exservicemen were entitled to "nothing less than an honorable discharge," notwithstanding the fact that this was not the type of discharge they were originally given. Therefore, I would offer only this observation: that there has already been established, as a result of these two cases, the precedent of review of the military files and, in fact, a reversal by the Supreme Court of a military ruling in a matter of this nature.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DEVINE. I appreciate the contribution which the gentleman from Illinois has made.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Ohio for his sincere efforts in behalf of General Walker, a personal friend of mine. I had the opportunity of knowing General Walker when he was stationed in Little Rock, Ark., under very trying and difficult circumstances. The conduct of this outstanding general officer and hero of the wars of this country is a record that very few have surpassed in this great country.

Mr. Speaker, General Walker was widely known in that area in the brief time that he was stationed there in command of military forces for his strong stand for Americanism, all patriotic endeavors, and for the information he tried to convey to all those around him relative to the Communist menace, the very enemy this great legislative body has been directing its arguments against this afternoon in the debate on the floor of the House relative to the mutual security program, or foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, many of the Members of the House who are strong proponents argue that this program of foreign aid combats international communism. The hour is growing late, and I do not propose to go into all the facets here. I did have the opportunity of being the first Member of the House of Representatives

the gentleman has referred to that happened in Europe a few months ago exposed by this discredited weekly.

So, in conclusion, I want to again express the hope that now that the dust has settled after this investigation and report has been made, in view of the situation in Berlin, as has been so well described by the President, and in this time of peril let us all hope that they will take another look at this and give to General Walker an assignment where the very best of his talents may be used most effectively, and that certainly is in a position of leadership in connection with our combat troops.

Mr. DEVINE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not rather ironical that just this afternoon we have been debating how we could help other countries, some of them very friendly, how we could help them develop and save their freedoms while distinguished and heroic leaders of our own Armed Forces are being denied freedom of speech on matters that affect the survival of our country? It is not General Walker, but the Army leadership who are on trial today, and I hope that they will move rapidly to correct the situation into which they have brought the leadership of the Armed Forces of our country.

Mr. DEVINE. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota. It is most ironical.

In reply to my request for an investigation to the chairman of the Armed Forces Committee, I received a letter dated August 14. I ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., August 14, 1961.

Hon. SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DEVINE: I have just returned to my office from a short absence and wish to acknowledge your letter of August 1 concerning Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker.

You outline the series of actions which you have taken with reference to this matter and conclude by requesting an immediate investigation of the whole General Walker episode.

This committee has followed this matter closely since its inception. Initially it was necessary to await the completion of the investigation by a specially appointed Inspector General, Lieutenant General Brown. You will recall that Gen. Bruce Clark, who commands the Army forces in Europe, selected Lieutenant General Brown as a special Inspector General for the purpose of this investigation.

I am sure you know that verbatim Inspector General reports are not made available to the public. However, I requested and received a classified summary of the report, in this case. That summary contained the basis for the action which was taken by the Secretary of the Army.

I fully realize that General Walker is an able and loyal officer. Certainly, neither of these points are in controversy. The only

point in controversy is whether or not General Walker was sufficiently guilty of an abuse of discretion as to justify the verbal admonishment which he received. The special Inspector General, finding the decision of General Clark and the concurrence of the Secretary of the Army were in accord in approving the actions which were taken with reference to General Walker.

While we both recognize that many are in disagreement with that decision, it cannot be disputed that the Secretary of the Army had full authority to reach that decision. While I share your feelings that General Walker has made a fine military record, I do not feel that any good purpose would be served by instituting the investigation which you request.

Sincerely yours,

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

Mr. DEVINE. To that letter I immediately replied on August 15 to the chairman, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 15, 1961.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representative, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter dated August 14, 1961, in which you decline to conduct an investigation concerning the removal of Gen. Edwin A. Walker as commanding officer of the 24th Infantry Division because you "do not feel that any good purpose would be served by instituting the investigation" * * *.

It is with regret that I learned of your decision, and I am accordingly introducing a concurrent resolution in the House tomorrow, August 16, requesting the establishment of a joint committee to conduct a full and complete investigation.

Further, I have reserved a special order at the end of legislative business on that date, at which time I expect to explore this overall problem. You may wish to be on the floor at that time as I shall undoubtedly mention your letter declining this investigation.

Very truly yours,

SAMUEL L. DEVINE.

On the same date I directed a letter to the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, U.S. Senate, sending him a complete file of my correspondence concerning this matter, and suggesting that perhaps that body might, through that committee, wish to initiate an independent investigation.

On yesterday I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 372 to establish a joint committee to conduct a hearing and complete investigation and study of the facts and circumstances surrounding the removal of the general. This resolution reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby established a joint committee which shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the facts and circumstances surrounding the removal of Major General Edwin A. Walker as Commanding General of the Twenty-fourth Infantry Division, and his reassignment to other duties. The members of the joint committee shall report to their respective Houses as promptly as possible the results of their investigation and study, together with such recommendations as the joint committee may deem advisable.

Sec. 2. (a) The membership of the joint committee shall consist of five Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker

of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than three Members shall be of the same political party. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointments. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members, and shall determine the number of members necessary to constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(b) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, within or outside the United States, to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the joint committee or any member of the joint committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

(c) The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949 for comparable duties. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

(d) Expenses of the joint committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Now, as an offshoot of this, I have received a lot of correspondence. Apparently, one of the wire services carried this story in the Stars and Stripes overseas. Of course I find it necessary at this time to protect the authors of these two letters, which I am going to read in part to you, but it does give an idea of how some people feel who have been associated with this patriotic American.

This first letter is undated. I received it about the 13th of this month:

DEAR MR. DEVINE: I read the inclosed article in the Stars and Stripes and was delighted to see that someone is seeking the facts of the General Walker case.

As a former member of the — Division, I feel that I am familiar with the case. I was chagrined when General Walker was relieved without an investigation. The basis of the relief was an article in the Overseas Weekly, the poorest excuse for a newspaper I have ever seen.

I have been in Germany for — months as a member of the U.S. Army, during which time I have scrutinized this paper. Whenever possible news of American forces is reported as to cast disfavor upon all aspects of our Army.

This paper has succeeded, to a degree, in perpetuating an attitude of "Go Home Yankee" among the Germans by being a decrier of our inequities; creating a non-moral atmosphere among our troops by publication of immoral photographs and articles; confusing and misleading our soldiers by distortion and clever phrasing of the news and reporting of half-truths; demeaning the officer corps by continuous and sensational reporting of wrongdoings by officers.

I request that you make a careful analysis of this weekly. I realize your disadvantage in not knowing our situation and that you

15178

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 17

felt he was in a position to throw some light on what I describe as this general "fiasco." I might say this, that I do not feel at liberty at this time to reveal the contents of the reply received from General Walker. He did indicate that he felt he was not in a position to speak fully at this time but some of the comments that he wrote to me actually were pathetic.

Here in this great country of ours, here where we have freedom of speech, a major general of the U.S. Army did not feel free to speak. What was his crime?

I directed this letter on August 1. I said this to Chairman VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Scores of people have written their Congressmen demanding an investigation to determine the true facts relative to the allegations made against Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker.

And if I may interpolate, I have received many, many letters, and I know many of my colleagues, such as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER], and others, have told me of numbers of letters that they have received from the citizens of this Nation demanding to know what are the true facts. They are trying not to judge the case by themselves. They want to know the facts. They want to be able to reach an independent conclusion as to whether or not this great American has been injudiciously treated.

Now to go on with this letter:

On April 25, 1961, I requested a report on this matter from the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara. Brig. Gen. C. R. Rodriguez acknowledged this request on April 27, 1961.

The following day Lt. Col. William A. Hunter also acknowledged my request and stated that the Secretary of the Army had directed the Commander in Chief, U.S. Army Europe, on April 17, 1961, to transfer General Walker from command of the 24th Infantry Division in Germany to Headquarters, U.S. Army Europe, pending the outcome of an official investigation of reported statements and actions of General Walker.

A month passed with no further report, and I made another request for reports of the investigation on May 26, 1961.

Thereafter, a mimeographed sheet dated June 12, 1961, which, incidentally, is on the same date I directed a letter to the President, issued by the Office of the Chief of Legislative Liaison, was received, a copy of which I attach to my letter to Chairman VINSON:

This mimeographed report is a self-explanatory formal announcement of the admonishment of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker for making derogatory statements about prominent Americans; further, that his actions exceeded the limits of propriety for an officer of the Army.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Lest there be any misunderstanding by anyone reading the Record, the gentleman mentioned a few moments ago a letter received from General Walker.

Mr. DEVINE. Yes.

Mr. KYL. I think it might be well to state at this point that there is nothing in this letter from the general which would be deemed improper by even his most severe critics.

Mr. DEVINE. That is most correct. I believe I have shown this letter to the gentleman from Iowa and he is fully aware of what he said.

Further quoting from the letter:

These unsupported conclusions with no corroborating facts resulted in telephone conversations and finally on June 29, 1961, I directed another letter, this time to Col. V. L. Bowers, Secretary Army, Chief Legislative Liaison, specifically requesting "the specific charges in detail, the source of complaint, copies of the Overseas Weekly articles that gave rise to the investigation, a copy of the speech referred to heretofore, the results of the investigation, and General Walker's side of the story." On July 19, 1961, Lt. Col. James Campbell hand delivered a letter from Maj. Gen. H. A. Gerhardt, a copy of which is attached hereto and marked exhibit 2. This letter enclosed Thermofax copies of the publication the Overseas Weekly dated April 16 and April 23, 1961, which are available to you on request.

The key sentence in this letter, in my opinion, appears at the bottom of page 1 and says, "no substantial evidence was revealed that General Walker had referred to former President Harry S. Truman, Dean Acheson, and Eleanor Roosevelt as 'definitely pink' as alleged by the Overseas Weekly, but it was established that he had stated or inferred that these prominent persons are leftist-influenced or affiliated."

The top paragraph on page 2 of the reference letter is also significant. You will note, however, that this letter ignores most of the questions contained in my request on June 29, 1961.

Meanwhile, I have been in touch with Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker and he, for reasons best known to himself, declines to shed further light on the overall picture. It doesn't take much imagination to see that he has been effectively muzzled either by the Army, the Secretary of Defense, or someone else in higher authority.

Mr. Chairman, the American people demand and are entitled to know the facts in this case. Members of Congress are also entitled to know whether the Secretary of the Army or someone else in high authority acted hastily and injudiciously in relieving General Walker of his command.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas. If I am not mistaken, the gentleman from Texas represents the district which is the residence of General Walker.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is correct.

First, I want to say I completely share the gentleman's estimation of General Walker. I am pleased to know of the interest that has been expressed here and the information that has been developed during the gentleman's remarks relating to this incident which is the subject of your discussion. It happens that General Walker is a constituent of mine. He was born and reared in the district which I represent. His mother and his brother live there now. They are highly respected people. I feel, as I am sure the gentleman does, and as he has indicated in his talk, that now, of all times, this country needs to make the very best use of the best talent that is

available in the military services because of the world situation as it has developed. It is admitted by all concerned, including the report on the investigation, that General Walker is an outstanding combat leader.

Gen. Mark Clark, whom many of us know personally and who also comes from Texas, in his report was quoted as saying:

General Walker's past military and combat record is commendable. No one can question General Walker's sincerity of purpose.

He is only 51 years of age. The gentleman from Ohio has already outlined some of his combat record, which I think I can say without hesitation probably is the most outstanding record of anyone his age in the entire U.S. Army today. I think the record reflects that. He has received practically all the decorations that can be awarded to a combat leader. He has demonstrated his qualities of leadership time after time in the field of battle.

Therefore, I want to join with the gentleman in expressing the hope that now that the dust is settled, after this investigation and report, the Army will get around to assigning General Walker to a command in keeping with his talents and with his past record. The times are too perilous to waste a talent like this. It seems to me imperative that the question of an assignment which would make the maximum and best use of General Walker's capabilities and his combat leadership should be decided in the very near future. At least that is my hope.

I recently received a letter from the Secretary of the Army in reply to an inquiry I made about General Walker in which, among other things, he said:

General Walker is presently assigned to an important position related to the planning and supervision of Army operations in Europe.

That is fine. I am sure whatever he is doing is being done well.

Beyond doubt and above everything I hope that the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Defense, and the President, if he should be consulted further about it, will see to it that General Walker is given an assignment that will make the very best use of his remarkable combat leadership talents.

Again I want to thank the gentleman for this privilege of joining him in his commendation that is due General Walker. The times, as I said before, are too perilous for us to be involved too much in what I think are these petty complaints about General Walker that were exposed by a salacious, discredited newspaper in Europe that was barred from being sold on the newsstands in the military installations by the general who was in command at Heidelberg. Finally it was permitted to resume only after agreement was made that they would clean it up, and there is not much indication that it has been cleaned up. So I regard a lot of these things as rather petty and relatively unimportant.

In these times of peril certainly it is no time to be making decisions not to use the quality of the leadership such as General Walker has, or having that related in any way to these things that

1964

Buck
Speaker

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

15177

MAJ. GEN. EDWIN A. WALKER, U.S.
ARMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, this will be a change of pace from the important legislation the House has been considering today concerning the Mutual Security Act. I think, however, the subject matter of my remarks in this special order are perhaps of equal importance.

I intend to address the membership on the subject of the removal of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker as the commanding officer of the 24th Infantry Division, U.S. Army, stationed in critical Germany.

I may say this is the first time in over 2½ years I have been a Member of this body that I have taken a special order on any subject. But I think a rank injustice has been done a very important member of our military, a high-ranking officer.

At the outset, let us examine for a moment: Who is General Walker?

Edwin A. Walker was born on November 10, 1909, at Center Point, Tex. He was appointed to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point on July 1, 1927, from Texas. He graduated in 1931.

He had a very distinguished service during the time he has been in the military forces. From December 1939 to November 1941, he was battery commander, 2d Battalion, 13th Field Artillery Regiment, at Schofield Barracks, T.H.

From May 1943, to November 1945, he was commanding officer of the 3d Regiment, 1st Special Service Force, in Alaska and Italy; commanding officer, 1st Special Service Force, Italy, France, and Germany; commanding officer, 474th Infantry Regiment, 3d Army, Germany, and commanding officer, Task Force A, Oslo, Norway.

Thereafter, from October 1950 to August 1951, he was assistant commandant, Ranger Training Command, Fort Benning, Ga. He trained ranger companies, airborne, one for each division, including Korea.

He had the fortunate or unfortunate experience of being the chief, U.S. Army military district at Little Rock, Ark., during the period from August 1957 to October 1959.

Since October 1959, until he was removed in April of this year, he was commanding general, 24th Infantry Division, Augsburg, Germany.

He is not an armchair soldier, as you can see.

He has received the Silver Star, the Bronze Star with oak leaf cluster, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, second award, the Senior Paratrooper Badge, the Legion of Merit with cluster, the Commendation Ribbon, the Korean Unit Citation, the Korean Service Medal, the Asiatic Pacific Medal, the American Defense Medal, the United Nations Service Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, the Europe, Africa, and Middle East Medal, the American Campaign Medal, the Army of Occupation Medal, and the National Defense Service Medal.

In addition to that he has received the French Croix de Guerre in December 1943, the Norwegian Order of St. Olav, 1946, the Order of the British Empire, 1945, and the Korean Ulchi Medals with gold and silver star.

Now, I do not know General Walker. I never had heard of him prior to the incident which I am relating. When I did hear of it, however, I became disturbed and started to make some inquiries. Among other inquiries I directed a letter to the Pentagon on June 29 of this year making a general inquiry, and I made this statement, which I still feel applies today:

I continue to be amazed at the demand for freedom of expression, freedom of thought, and freedom of speech for those advocates of wild, radical, liberal leftist line and their staunch supporters through the American Civil Liberties Union and other such organizations.

Yet, on the other hand, if someone dares to speak for constitutional government or patriotism, he is immediately throttled, threatened, transferred, or repudiated.

One report here says that General Walker is an authentic American hero with an outstanding record of 30 years' service to his country as a professional soldier and patriot. Even the Army's report in the case contains the statement that "no one can question General Walker's sincerity of purposes." In spite of his record, he was treated shamefully by his superiors. Why? This report states he instituted a successful pro-American troop indoctrination program in his own division, reportedly the only American division capable of entering the line immediately in case of hostilities in Europe. Now, with the Berlin crisis worsening week by week, General Walker has been taken from command of this combat division. The morale of his troops has suffered a severe blow and a demise of the problue program has left a gap which will be difficult to fill.

What is the problue program? I never heard of it before. I have learned it is this: In teaching the troops of this great Nation about what goes on in this world, it was suggested that he take an anti-Communist line. General Walker is not a negative person. He said:

Let us not talk anti; let us be positive. Let us be pro. Let us be for something.

"Problue" means pro-American, patriotic, anti-Red. That is the very thing for which he was charged by a newspaper, if it could actually bear that name; something called the Overseas Weekly, with doing something that was wrong. What about this Overseas Weekly? It is referred to by members of the service as the oversexed weekly. Why? Because it deals in such things as pictures that perhaps border on being pornographic. One report I received here says that this is what precipitated the controversy which resulted in General Walker's suspension and transfer from his command.

Paul Harvey in an article on June 2 described it as a "slime mongering, girlie stripping scandal sheet called the Overseas Weekly; a smutty leftwing tabloid."

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALFORD], who I see on the floor of the House this afternoon, described the attack on the general as having been engineered by a "salacious overseas pink sheet which was banned from distribution to our Armed Forces on complaint of a chaplain's committee."

This is further contained in this report:

For a period of more than 2 years prior to the announcement of the admonition of General Walker by the Army, the Overseas Weekly and its staff had been refused accreditation by the Department of Defense.

This meant that the paper should not have been allowed to be sold on the Army Stars and Stripes newsstands overseas during that period. Nevertheless, it was so sold. I will ask the question, why?

Another question is directed here. Who in the Pentagon looked the other way while this was going on? We ask the question, why? And another question: Why did the Department of Defense accredit the publisher of the paper and two minor members of her staff the week preceding the admonishment of General Walker? Why? Why was it so imperative, this report asks, that this foul, discredited sheet be protected and coddled by direction from the very heads of Government, while a great and gallant soldier was stripped of his command, and denied a well-merited promotion to a command, in his own home State, and limited to an administrative post in Germany until such time as the Army civilian heads could safely demote him even still further?

One thing that is very difficult to understand, one thing that created my curiosity is why General Walker was relieved of his command prior to the institution of any investigation. It is very difficult to understand about a man who has this tremendous record. Here is another report on "What kind of man is General Walker?" This appeared in a column by a Mr. Holmes Alexander who has a syndicated column across this Nation. He wrote this:

At the outbreak of World War II, he volunteered for extrahazardous duty and trained with a Canadian group for special action in ski, mountain, amphibious, and airborne fighting, at Helena, Mont. As a regimental commander in this special force, he served in the Aleutians, and later in Italy, France, Germany, and Norway * * * his preceding the famous battle of Cassino * * *. He spent 20 months in the Korean conflict, as regimental commander, deputy chief of prisoner of war affairs, senior adviser to the crack Republic of Korea 1st Corps.

On August 1 of this year, Mr. Speaker, I directed a letter to the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, after having conducted what I considered an independent investigation in an effort to determine the true facts. As I say, I do not know General Walker. I had never heard of him before newspaper reports of this incident. I thought I was getting the run-around from the Department of Defense and other places. I directed a letter actually to the General himself asking him if he

August 25

volume can be traced to petroleum. There are 3 refineries in or adjacent to the city, 3 interstate pipelines, 78 oilfield equipment houses, 28 oil-hauling concerns, 84 oilfield service houses, 53 oilfield property brokers, 39 consulting geologists and geophysicists, 73 oil company exploration and production offices, and 41 drilling contractors.

Wyoming produces about as much oil as Brazil and Mexico combined. And of the \$22 million spent annually for petroleum exploration in Wyoming, it is estimated that 90 percent is spent in and from Casper.

This then is Casper—Indian campground, frontier fort, cow town, sheep town, oil town—imaginative, impulsive, colorful, and, as might be expected from its past history, always on the go.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWN ON THE GO: CASPER, WYO., IS VIGOROUS AND RESTLESS—AN EXCITING BLEND OF FRONTIER HERITAGE AND MODERN INDUSTRY

(By Peggy Simson Curry)

This was Indian country before the fur trappers arrived. It was Oregon Trail country before the cattle came winding in a long dust from Texas to the wind-ripped grasslands and before the Irish sheepherders danced to concertina music on the summer ranges of the Big Horn Mountains.

Casper sprawls along the banks of the North Platte River in central Wyoming—a town of strong personality, vigorous, restless, cosmopolitan; a land of blindingly bright summer days and winter blizzards, of raging winds and spectacular thundershowers. Casper's history is as violent and full of contrasts as its weather.

You can see the contrasts today. By the river, only 15 minutes by auto from the bustling center of town, across earth where Indian arrowheads are exposed by the fierce brush of wind or the wash of spring rains, is the site of the first white man's cabin in the region, built by a band of trappers in 1812. Almost in the shadows of one of modern Casper's oil refineries stands old Fort Casper, originally known as Platte Bridge Station. Casper and Casper, the fort and the town, both were named in honor of Lt. Caspar Collins, who lost his life leading an attack against superior Indian forces in 1865 at the battle of Platte Bridge. (A frontier Army clerk is said to have given the town its incorrect spelling.) The old fort and the modern town frame our story.

When the Oregon Trail migration began in 1840, the covered wagons gathered where the city now stands, and a safe river crossing was established through the turbulent North Platte. Brigham Young camped here in 1847, when a few trappers' shacks and the rutted trail were the only signs of the white man; and the river crossing became known as Mormon Ferry. By 1852 the number of settlers bound for Oregon had reached a peak, and the Indians were no longer placated by presents or platitudes. In 1859 an Army post (Platte Bridge Station) was established.

In 1868 the cattle began to arrive in large numbers, and Judge Joseph Maul Carey established the CY Ranch. The ranch's "poorest pasture land" was to become the site of modern Casper. Oldtimers spoke of Casper as "a town built on buffalo chips," for the earliest residents were alfalfa growers who gathered fertilizer where they could.

Through the streets of the town rode the Hole-in-the-Wall rustling gang, pursued to its remote hideout in the Powder River country by Bob Divine, foreman of Carey's

ranch. Bob vowed he'd "bring back anything wearing the CY brand."

One of the most famous of the many inmates of Casper's jail was Red Cloud, great chief of the Sioux, arrested for hunting antelope to feed his people. The record reads that he was "killing game out of season."

The year 1888 was an important one for the town. The first band of sheep arrived in what is now Natrona County. And the first crude buildings, with corrugated iron roofs and floors of packed gumbo, appeared that summer.

In the fall of 1888 there occurred an event that was to have even more lasting effects upon Casper. Some 3 miles from the rough new business houses with their flanking of tent residences the first oil well was drilled, known appropriately as Casper well.

Thus, 2 years before Wyoming became a State, the town built on buffalo chips was beginning to have thoughts of another economic base.

While cowboys and Indians roamed the single main street and the canvas walls of the first homes shuddered and popped under the onslaught of the persistent March wind in the spring of 1889, the Casper Mail carried this item: "The reported oil strike at Casper well last week is still shrouded in mystery. Work has been stopped *** workmen claiming that the 2-inch cable is broken and the drill is at the bottom of the well. It is a noticeable fact that the manager and his men have been locating oil claims ever since the 'break' occurred."

By June, 90 claims had been filed in the Casper area, most of them in the Salt Creek Field. And while other adjoining oilfields, particularly the Big Muddy, have contributed to the growth of Casper, none has been so significant as the Salt Creek Field, approximately 40 direct miles north of town, on the road toward the Big Horn Mountains. Here, in a basin of prairie, surrounded by wind-carved monuments of rock and lifts of broken ridges, was the scene not only of concentrated oil activity but also of violent claim struggles, bawdy and vigorous camp life. Here was found crude oil that came out of the ground so rich that it was said to be "like no other oil anywhere on earth."

Salt Creek's first well was brought in by the Pennsylvania Oil & Gas Co. in the fall of 1889. While the cattlemen's range wars were beginning and the sheep business was in its infancy, samples of Salt Creek crude oil were on their way to Pittsburgh for chemical analysis. President Phillip Mark Shannon of Pennsylvania Oil, impressed by results of the tests, continued drilling with great success.

The Union Pacific, Denver & Gulf Railroad used this "natural" oil for lubrication for many years. During the first 5 months of that time, the oil wasn't even treated, there being no refinery in town.

While growing Casper dealt with murder, cattle rustling, problems of education and street development, oil was being hauled from Salt Creek and other fields by the "string team" method. A local newspaper described this early stage of transportation:

"Two string teams were loaded out from here with 26,000 pounds of piping. One of the teams was made up of 16 head of horses and 4 wagons and when the wagons were coupled out to receive the piping, the entire outfit occupied a space of ground 240 feet long and was the longest string outfit that ever went out of Casper."

Early in 1895 Pennsylvania Oil built the first small refinery in Casper (it was also the first in the State). Politicians, local and national, were subjected to the "45-minute tour." And when they emerged, their shoes and clothing were smudged with oil, but they were smiling.

While dynamic Mark Shannon was heading exploration of Salt Creek, English, French, Dutch, and Belgian businessmen were also becoming interested. Pennsylvania

Oil was taken over in 1905 by the Société Belgo-Américaine des Pétroles du Wyoming. This, in turn, was absorbed by a company founded by English, French, and American capital.

But it was the Midwest Oil Co., formed in 1911, that began the most intensive exploration of Salt Creek and built a refinery in Casper and a pipeline and telephone line connecting the town with the field.

There came a time of violent claim disputes; and companies hired line riders, fast on the trigger, to protect their claims at any cost. Often sheriff or deputies arrived too late to prevent bloodshed.

During the latter part of 1916 and most of 1917 Casper became a boomtown. Men in all walks of life deserted professions and business interests to buy and sell oil stock. The Midwest Hotel was a scene of wild speculation. Those who couldn't get expensive hotel rooms for "offices" set up business in the lobby without benefit of desk or filing cabinets. The town overflowed with people, and new companies were formed overnight. But by the fall of 1917 many brokers had gone out of business, and the town settled into a steadier economy. By 1923 three large refineries were running, one of them the largest in the world at that time.

A second oil flourish hit Casper following World War II, when intensive exploration began not only of new areas but also of old ones. The chance of finding uranium provided an added inducement for visitors. With the upsurge of the oil business Casper became known as "Oil Capital of the Rockies."

In today's Casper, a town of 40,000 as compared to the settlement of 100 when the first well was drilled, two-thirds of the business volume can be traced to petroleum. There are three refineries in or adjacent to the city, three interstate pipelines, 78 oilfield equipment houses, 28 oil hauling concerns, 84 oilfield service houses, 53 oilfield property brokers, 39 consulting geologists and geophysicists, 73 oil company exploration and production offices, and 41 drilling contractors.

Wyoming produces about as much oil as Brazil and Mexico combined. And of the \$22 million spent annually for petroleum exploration in Wyoming, it is estimated that 90 percent is spent in and from Casper.

Today's Casper is as colorful as its vivid past. "Nobody ever goes to bed in Casper" is an assumption based on visual evidence, for there are people moving on Center Street any night of the week between dark and daylight. And, as in the days of the frontier, a man's best passport to recognition is the force and individuality of his own character.

It is not considered an anomaly to see a cowboy wearing his high-heeled boots at a gathering where tuxedos predominate. Nor is it considered strange that a wealthy man's friend may be a sheepherder.

The town is creative. Art classes are crowded, night and day, at growing Casper College; and art exhibits hang in banks, cafes, and hotels. Music is a vital interest in the town; and it is often remarked, between pride and laughter, that an amazing number of people turn out to hear anyone play a piano. The community concert series is well supported, and the civil symphony boasts that 15 of its musicians travel more than 100 miles to attend weekly rehearsals. Casper's College's theater-in-the-round draws packed houses, and anyone in town is likely to show up in grease paint at the Paradise Valley Play House.

This then is Casper—Indian campground, frontier fort, cow town, sheep town, oil town—imaginative, impulsive, colorful, and, as might be expected from its past history, always on the go.

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15937

Welch goes on to relate that a person who had been trying to convert one local chapter into "a hotbed of anti-Semitism" was dropped from the society, and he pledges that the society will never become a haven for anti-Semitic feeling "so long as I am directing its policies." After several additional paragraphs explaining why no member of the Jewish faith can also be a Communist (and pointing out that Karl Marx was "probably the most vicious anti-Semite of all times"), Welch concludes with the following warning:

"There is only one real danger in the charge of anti-Semitism today, to the man who actually is not anti-Semitic. It is that the utter (and in some cases malicious) unfairness of the charge may cause him to react with anger against Jews in general, and then begin to let some of his feeling creep into his writings or his speeches.. That brings on even more vitriolic attacks, with a few more straws to support them. And so the development continues until the man in question winds up actually becoming violently anti-Semitic. And he seldom realizes that this was the Communist game and purpose all along, of which the majority of Jews who innocently helped the Reds to implement it were as unaware and innocent as the ordinary Methodist who supports the National Council of Churches. And many an anti-Communist fighter of great promise in America has had his career ruined and his effectiveness destroyed by letting himself fall into that carefully prepared trap."

This will never happen to him, Welch declares; to his "thousands of Jewish friends" he pledges, "I shall remain your friend, no matter what happens." (One other bit of information bearing on Welch's attitude is that he has been consistently anti-Nasser, viewing the Arab nationalists as aiding the Communists in gaining control of the Middle East.)

All the evidence available at the moment suggests the presence of a certain ambivalence in the Birch Society on the matter of anti-Semitism. Welch himself seems to be personally without bias toward Jews, and he wants the society to reflect this position. Yet there is no doubt that some local leaders and members are well-known anti-Semites. With one after another of the rabbinical associations and major Jewish civic groups speaking out in complete condemnation of Welch and his movement, there will be rising pressures to respond to the "Jewish attacks." Probably, Welch will continue to allow some light flirtation with the more sophisticated anti-Semitic spokesmen. But it is a testimony to American maturity and the activities of Jewish defense agencies that open anti-Semitism is seen as a dead end today for any "middle-of-the-road" right-wing organization."

One final aspect of the society should be noted. Welch's writings have a remarkable combination of fantastic allegation and sweet reasonableness. Along with his proposals advocating drastic action against the Communist agents all over America will go reminders to be polite while making menacing telephone calls to local officials, to exercise self-restraint when attacked unfairly, and to take no action which violates "moral principles." "It is a major purpose of the John Birch Society," he often explains, "one never to be overlooked by its members, to help in every way we can--by example as well as precept--to restore an abiding sense of moral values to greater use as a guide of conduct for individuals, for groups, and ultimately for nations." If there are some right-fundamentalists to whom this sort of passage sounds a bit like the National Council of Churches, the total blend of warm-hearted, main-street vigilantism is still appealing to the majority of Welch's followers.

Whatever the specific prospects for the Birch Society—and I consider them unhappy

pilly bright—the 1960's will surely be years of expansion for the fundamentalist right in this country. Several things point toward that conclusion.

First, this will be a decade of immense frustration for American foreign policy. We will witness increased neutralism among the new nations; increased militancy among the nonwhite peoples over questions of color; constant military and scientific pressures from the Russians and, soon, the Chinese Communists; diminished American influence in the United Nations; greater conflict in Latin America; and continued outlays of foreign assistance which do not "buy loyalties" or "deliver votes" on critical issues. If the United States can simply prevent these situations from exploding, most informed students of diplomacy would think we had done well. But cutting losses inflicted by the stagnant 1950's and preparing hopeful future positions is not going to appeal to the right-fundamentalist masses (or the frantic pacifist variety on the left either). The right is unshakable in its faith in unilateral solutions and its belief that each loss for America can be traced to a Communist agent or "Comsymp" in the CIA, at the New York Times, in the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, or at the Yale Law School. And the inescapable strategic retreats of the early 1960's (Laos is a good example) will lend fuel to the fires on the right.

Second, the domestic racial issue also poses a serious threat of a rise in right fundamentalism. In the 1960's the struggle for Negro equality will move increasingly into areas outside the South. Lower middle-class and middle-class resentments against Negro neighbors and Negro competitors are bound to increase. The crescendo of Negro militancy and the spreading use of Government power to enforce civil rights will peel away the already thinned layers of toleration in many sectors of the Northern and Western population. In this area of public policy, groups like the Birch Society—which are not explicitly anti-Negro but oppose compulsory integration—have a promising position, and the reservoirs of white hostility, unless carefully and wisely channeled by both white and Negro liberal leaders, could fill the well of the fundamentalist right to overflowing.

Third, there exists the distinct possibility of an unprecedented coalition of Catholic and Protestant right fundamentalists in the 1960's. Only those who know little about the history of American Catholicism would assume that this is a monolithic community. Yet many factors suggest that the 1960's may see an even deeper division of American Catholics into warring ideological factions than has obtained at any time in the past. Already some influential Catholics are complaining bitterly that President Kennedy has joined the liberalist establishment, that he has been selling out Catholic Church interests, and that the administration of the first Catholic President may go down in history as the softest on communism. This is far from the dominant view among American Catholics. Indeed, it may represent the last thrashing of the old, superloyalist element in the American Catholic community—a group which will be goaded to extremism by the sight of an clerical, illiterate, sophisticated Catholic liberal in the White House. Under these conditions, and with the magic memory of Joseph McCarthy to help bridge the chasm of the Reformation, the fundamentalist Protestants and the fundamentalist Catholics may enter into an alliance (possibly inside the Birch Society).

But perhaps the central question mark for right-fundamentalism in the 1960's is not issues or groups but a man—Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona. At the moment, he is the beloved crusader of the right and he has given his fundamentalist supporters every possible encouragement. Before very

much longer, however, as the jockeying for position in 1964 begins, GOLDWATER will have to decide whether he wants to be a Republican presidential hopeful and Senate leader or the head of an ideological crusade. If he chooses two-party politics, GOLDWATER will have to undercut the Birch Society, for it could embarrass him by its extremism, and it is not under his control. (Already, GOLDWATER has called on Welch to resign because of his authoritarian controls and his charges against Eisenhower.) Many experienced observers of Washington politics doubt whether GOLDWATER has the personality and the paranoia to become a fundamentalist ideologue and wander in a political wilderness. However, if GOLDWATER should lose the Republican nomination to someone like Nelson Rockefeller and if he were to decide that there was no hope for his ambitions within the GOP, he could mold the fundamentalist right into a cohesive movement which would assume immediate political influence.

These, then, are the factors which point to a resurgence of the far rightwing in the 1960's. But, it should be said on the other side, a rejuvenated and expanded liberal movement is also likely to develop in the United States during the next few years. The signs are already present on American college campuses, where a decade of student apathy and fatalism is giving way to a revival of both liberal and (respectable) conservative political commitment. Whether the Kennedy administration will move from its first year of dreary if realistic compromise to give direction and enthusiasm to the liberal cause remains to be seen. At any rate, the resources are there to be marshaled, and they are potentially our greatest protection against the mounting right-fundamentalist threat.

Casper, Wyo.

MR. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an article published in the summer 1961 issue of "Petroleum Today." The article is entitled "Town on the Go," and was written by Peggy Simson Curry, who is a personal friend of the present occupant of the chair, my colleague from Wyoming [Mr. Hickey]. The article is the story of Casper, Wyo., a vigorous, restless, and exciting blend of frontier heritage and modern industry. The article describes the very rapid rise of this community out in the prairies, a rise that was encouraged largely by the discovery of oil in the area. Among the interesting attributes of Casper's rise has been the play on names among some of the community personalities. For example, one colorful early pioneer was called "Give a Damn" Jones, a nickname, of course, referring to one of his favorite expressions. Another was "Puzzle Face" Reed, who earned his title at the poker table. Still another was "Hard Winter" Davis. Still another, "Sod Corn" Gore. The Lucas brothers were referred to as "Big Bones" and "Little Bones." That was a reflection on some of their extracurricular activities.

The citizens of present-day Casper have an inherited fondness for nicknames. Ben Scherck, a realtor whose firm is the oldest in town, is still known as "See Ben" Scherck, on the basis of his catchy business slogan, "A Look Means a Lot."

I read from the article:

In today's Casper, a town of 40,000 as compared to the settlement of 100 when the first well was drilled, two-thirds of the business

15936

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 25

groups, publications, and personalities, stressing that Americanists can work in several forums at once for the cause. In May 1961, for example, Welch listed two pages of other anti-Communist groups which he endorsed and urged Birchers to support. These included the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, the American Council of Christian Laymen, the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation, the Catholic Freedom Foundation, the Christian Crusade, the Freedom Club (of Los Angeles), Freedom in Action (Houston), the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists, the Network of Patriotic Letter Writers (Pasadena), and We, the People (Chicago). In turn, Welch's appearances are often sponsored by such groups: The Freedom Club of Rev. James Fifield arranged his Los Angeles rally, and the Sons of the American Revolution sponsored his Houston appearance.

To a large extent, Welch's personal selflessness and his salesmanship have already made him a rallying point for the fundamentalist right, and no recent rightwing group comes to mind which has achieved so large and solid a dues-paying and working membership. In a world of Communist advances in Asia and Africa, pressures on Berlin, vast changes in the relation of white to colored populations throughout the world, the Birch Society has developed a thoroughly satisfying way for the thin-lipped little lady from Wichita or the self-made manufacturer of plumbing fixtures in North Carolina to work in manageable little daily doses against "the Communists." The cancer of the unquestioned international Communist menace and the surgery of local pressure on the PTA and public library—here is a perfect appeal for right fundamentalism. This highlights the fact that the society's most successful efforts to date have not been on the national scene but on the soft underbelly of American democracy—those places where a minimum of pressure can often produce maximum terror and restrictive responses. Welch has stressed that school boards, city colleges, local businesses, local clergy, and similar targets are the ones to concentrate on. Above all, Welch has brought coordination to the fundamentalist right—coordinated targets, coordinated meetings and rallies, and coordinated pressure tactics. "All of a sudden," the director of a Jewish Community Council in one city reflected, "the rightwingers began to function like a disciplined platoon. We have had to contend with precision and saturation ever since."

II

If this is what the society advocates and how it functions, what are its immediate and long-range prospects? In the short run, the society has lost one of its most potent weapons—the element of secrecy. Those in local communities who felt the sting of Birch campaigns during 1959-61 report that it was the factor of surprise at these sudden fundamentalist pressures and the unawareness of their organizational source which threw them off balance. Now, however, the society has been brought into public view. Its authoritarian character and extremist statements have been attacked in both liberal and conservative newspapers; by important Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leaders; and by political figures as diverse as Richard Nixon, President John Kennedy, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, Representative Sam Rayburn, Senator Thomas E. Dodd, and even Senator Barry Goldwater himself. The fact that a prominent leader of the society who had been chosen as Washington lobbyist for the American Retail Federation was hastily discarded in June by the federation because of his Birch affiliation indicates that recent publicity has damaged the society's claim to respectability. One midwestern Congressman known for his open advocacy of rightwing movements felt

it wise recently to seek out liberal leaders from his community and explain privately that he did not support the Birch movement. Increasingly, those "solid" figures who joined the group when it was operating privately will have to face public disapproval of the society, and this will probably cause some falling away among borderline conservatives.

In the longer perspective, however, there are three specific factors which deserve mention in assessing the society's potential growth. The first is the authoritarian character of the group and the centralized control exercised by Robert Welch (a situation which has led Senator GOLDWATER to criticize Welch directly). According to the charter of the society, Welch is the absolute leader; there is no accounting of dues or contributions; there is no representative process or democratic system for selecting programs or defining positions; and Welch has the power (which he has used) to expel any member or chapter for reasons sufficient to him, without right of hearing or appeal on the expulsion. This has produced widespread criticism of Welch as a "little Hitler" and the society as a group run on Fascist lines. However, Welch has stressed again and again that members can disagree with him; that he doesn't expect any member to carry out a project which violates his conscience; and that the society definitely opposes an "enforced conformity" within its ranks. The controls, Welch explains, are needed to prevent Communist infiltration of the society—which he believes has already begun or will certainly begin as the society becomes more effective—and infiltration by hatemongers. This blend of leader principle and group self-protection has great appeal to right-fundamentalists and even to some rightwing conservatives. The authoritarian setup makes fine ammunition for liberal and mainstream conservative fire, but this is not likely to harm Welch a bit in his recruiting among fundamentalists.

A second factor is Welch himself. The fantastic allegations he has made in "The Politician"—even though the book has not been endorsed by the council and is, indeed, repudiated by some members—have branded him as an unbalanced figure and convinced many staunch conservatives that Welch is a truly dangerous leader. The conservative Los Angeles Times recently did a thorough exposé of the society and wrote a stinging editorial which read Welch out of the conservative camp. Out of self-defense, Republicans in California joined in with the Times (especially in condemning Welch's attacks on Eisenhower), for the Birchers were proving so effective in pulling the Republican Party to the far right that some counterattack was felt to be essential. Welch himself has been highly equivocal about "The Politician." He insists that it was a private letter and never published, though he does not deny its authenticity. In the May 1961 issue of the Bulletin, he alludes to "questions or criticism from some of our most loyal members" relating to "The Politician." To these, he replies that, "the considerations involved in connection with many such matters are varied, overlapping, involved, and with too many ramifications to be explained in short compass. There are even times when, for reasons of strategy, we take an oblique approach to a specific objective, and fully to explain every step of our course would seriously handicap our effectiveness." Having decided not to say anything at all, Welch assured members that if he, "could give * * * the whole background of events" then objections might turn into approval, and with this, he dropped the subject of his magnum opus.

Those members and leaders of the society who find anything to criticize in "The Politician" (and many have fully endorsed the charges it featured) have stressed that

Welch is entitled to his personal views and that their disagreement with him on Ike or the two Dulles brothers indicates how free and diverse the society is.

In all probability Welch's talents as an organizer, salesman, proselytizer, and unifier of rightwing ranks outweigh (for the right-wing aristocracy) his tactical blunder in "The Politician." Since he controls the society fully, he is not likely to be replaced, and, indeed, there is no indication that an acceptable replacement is available either in the society or outside it. As long as he heads the society, however, "The Politician" will severely limit his credibility outside fundamentalist strongholds.

A third factor relating to the Birch Society's immediate prospects is the question of anti-Semitism. Repeated charges have been made that the society is a genteel endorser of anti-Semitic persons and literature. Welch has recommended to his members such anti-Semitic publications as Russell Maguire's American Mercury and Merlin K. Hart's Economic Council Newsletter. Hart—who often talks about a conspiracy of "Zionists and their confederates" controlling America and whose organization was described by a congressional committee investigating lobbying as one which relies on "an ill-concealed anti-Semitism"—is presently leader of the Birch Society's Manhattan chapter No. 26. In addition, such open anti-Semitic spokesmen as Conde McGinley have rushed to endorse the Birch Society. In the March 15, 1961, issue of Common Sense, McGinley wrote: "Inasmuch as we have received many inquiries from all over the United States regarding the John Birch Society, we want to go on record. We believe this to be an effective, patriotic group, in good hands."

On the other hand, Welch has always appealed to all religions, has urged Jews to join the society, and has warned that it is a "Communist tactic to stir up distrust and hatred between Jews and Gentiles, Catholics and Protestants, Negroes and whites." Much of the April 1961 issue of his Bulletin is devoted to a discussion of the allegation that the society is anti-Semitic, and what Welch has to say there is well worth close examination.

He opens by noting that "the most vicious" charges leveled against him have come from "such notorious anti-Semites as Lyrl Clark Van Hyning (Women's Voice), and Elizabeth Dilling (the Dilling Bulletin) on the grounds that my various committees and supporters are nothing but a 'bunch of Jews and Jew-kissers.' * * *." He then cites the names of Jewish members of the society such as Willi Schlamm, Julius Epstein, Morrie Ryskind, the late Alfred Kohlberg, and Rabbi Max Merritt, and indicates that it has been endorsed by the American Jewish League Against Communism (a Jewish right-fundamentalist group). Next, Welch explains that he probably has "more good friends of the Jewish faith than any other Gentile in America." When he was in the candy manufacturing business in Massachusetts, he recalls, he had many Jewish customers; he drank coffee in their kitchens at midnight, borrowed money from them and lent them money in return, and engaged in every kind of business and social activity with Jews.

Turning to some specific accusations, Welch admits that he used a pamphlet by Joseph Kamp as a source for his book "May God Forgive Us," and also paid Kamp a hundred dollars to go through "The Life of John Birch" to find errors. This was in 1954. But later, he says he became "aware of both the fact and the weapon of anti-Semitism in America, and I wanted no part of the whole argument." He had nothing further to do with Kamp after the 1954 contact, but he adds that he still simply doesn't know enough to say whether Kamp is really anti-Semitic.

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- SENATE

15935

that Ike may just be an "opportunistic politician" aiding the Communists. "I personally think he has been sympathetic to ultimate Communist aims, realistically willing to use Communist means to help them achieve their goals, knowingly accepting and abiding by Communist orders, and consciously serving the Communist conspiracy for all of his adult life."

2. The Birchers impugn the integrity and patriotism of those at the head of the major social and economic groups of the Nation. In a supplement to the February 1961 Bulletin, Welch announced that "Communist influences" are "very powerful in the top echelons of our educational system, our labor-union organizations, many of our religious organizations, and of almost every important segment of our national life. Insidiously but rapidly the Communists are now reaching the tentacles of their conspiracy downward throughout the whole social, economic, and political pyramid." Thus, the National Council of Churches or Christ is Communist minded, and from 3 to 5 percent of the Protestant clergy have been called actual Communists. "Treason," Welch further declares, "is widespread and rampant in our high army circles."

The American Medical Association has been "taken" and can no longer be depended upon for support in the fight against socialism. So too with the United States Chamber of Commerce, which has been preaching dangerously liberal and internationalist doctrines in its courses on practical politics. (When chamber leaders protested this slur, Welch replied that their outraged reaction was exactly like that of the State Department in the 1940's when charges of Communist infiltration were first raised.) The leadership of our universities, corporations, foundations, communications media—all are riddled with Communists, or "Comsymps" (a word Welch coined to avoid having to say whether a given person was a real party member or only a sympathizer).

Naturally, Welch and his colleagues are certain that these "Comsymps" elites are out to destroy him and his movement. References to persecution and images of martyrdom abound in Birch literature, ranging from incessant mention of how the patron saint (Senator McCarthy) was driven to his death, to suggestions that Welch may be murdered one day by the Communists.

3. The Birchers are convinced that the Communists have gone so far in penetrating American politics that there is little hope in the existing political system. In his letter to Khrushchev, Welch wrote that the Communists obviously intended to "maintain and increase (their) working control over both our major political parties." We cannot count on "politicians, political leadership, or even political action." Though the advocates of the nomination, on an American Party ticket, of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER for President, and J. STROM THURMOND for Vice President in 1964, Welch has warned his followers that even GOLDWATER—the most "Americanist" figure around in politics at the moment—is "still a politician" and therefore not to be relied upon. Welch has also had some things to say about "Jumping Jack" Kennedy. According to Welch, the Nation received "the exact Communist line * * * from Jack Kennedy's speeches, as quickly and faithfully as from the Worker or the National Guardian. * * *". And in 1959, Welch denounced the "Kennedy brat" for "finding the courage to join the Jackals picking at the corpse of McCarthy."

A particularly revealing sample of Welch's sense of American political realities is found in his description of the Eisenhower steal of the Republican nomination in 1952, one of the "dirtiest deals in American political history, participated in if not actually engineered by Richard Nixon." If Taft had not been cheated of the nomination, Welch predicted:

"It is almost certain that Taft would then have been elected President by a far greater plurality than was Eisenhower, that a grand rout of the Communists in our Government and in our midst would have been started, that McCarthy would be alive today, and that we wouldn't even be in this mess."

4. Most of the Birch Society's positive program consists of advocating the repeal of things or the removal of the Nation from something or somewhere. A partial list of the things that the society describes as wicked, Communist, and dangerous includes: U.S. membership in the United Nations, the International Labor Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Trade Organization, and UNICEF; membership in GATT (the General Agreement on Trades and Tariffs); reciprocal trade agreements; the useless and costly NATO; so-called defense spending; all foreign aid; diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and all other Communist nations; the National Labor Relations Act; social security; the graduated income tax; the Rural Electrification Administration, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and TVA; Government wage and price controls; forced integration; deliberately fraudulent U.S. Government bonds; the Federal Reserve System; urban renewal; fluoridation; metro government; the corporate dividend tax; the mental health racket; Federal aid to housing; and all programs regimenting farmers.

Some items on this list may be opposed by conservatives or by liberals. But taken together, it adds up to a nihilist's plea for the repeal of industrialism and the abolition of international politics. Such a program can be called rational or even political only by people who do not know what those words mean.

5. Finally, the Birch Society advocates both "direct action" and "dirty tactics" to "break the grip of the Communist conspiracy." Unlike those right-fundamentalist groups which have energetic leaders but passive memberships, the Birchers are decidedly activist. "Get to work or learn to talk Russian," is a slogan Welch recommends to his followers, and they are certainly hard at work. From national headquarters in Belmont, Mass., Welch formulates a set of complementary national and local action programs, then issues them to members through directives in the bulletin and contacts with chapter leaders. A mixture of traditional and fundamentalist techniques is prescribed. The local programs include infiltration of community organizations such as PTA ("to take them away from the Communists"); harassment of "pro-Communist" speakers at church meetings, political gatherings, and public forums; creation of local front groups (e.g., the Committee Against Summit Entanglements, College Graduates Against Educating Traitors at Government Expense, the Committee To Impeach Earl Warren, and the Committee to Investigate Communist Influences at Vassar College); campaigns to secure endorsement of Birch positions and signatures for Birch petitions in all groups that Birch members belong to (e.g., veterans and business organizations); letters and telephone calls to local public officials, leading citizens, and newspapers who support what the society opposes or oppose the society directly; monthly telephone calls to the local public library to make sure it has copies of the five rightwing books recommended by Welch every month.

The national campaigns are carefully pinpointed efforts. They range from letter and postcard writing to national advertising campaigns. In the past 2 years, Birchers have been told to: write the National Boy Scouts director and demand to know why the president of the National Council of Churches addressed their national jamboree; insist personally and in writing each time a member files American, United, or Eastern

Airlines that they stock Human Events and National Review on their planes; write to Newsweek to protest a "pro-FLN Communist" story (the society has a crush on Jacques Soustelle), to Life protesting the "glorification" of Charles Van Doren, and to the NBC network and the Purex Corp. for sponsoring a TV drama favorable to Sacco and Vanzetti; circulate petitions and write letters on the No. 1 project of the moment, to impeach Chief Justice Warren and thereby "give the Communists a setback." Welch also sends out the copy for punchy postcards to be addressed to national political leaders. To cite instances in 1960 alone: to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., at the U.N., "Two questions, Mr. Lodge: Who murdered Banz-Jensen? And which side are you on?"; to Secretary of State Christian Herter, "Castro is a Communist, Trujillo is an anti-Communist. Whose side are you on?"; and to President Eisenhower, on the eve of the scheduled summit conference, "Dear President Eisenhower: If you go, don't come back."

The last postcard stirred some protests from society members, who felt that Welch's savage little message to the President was a bit too strong. Welch set them straight in the Bulletin: "It is one of our many sorrows that, in fighting the evil forces which now threaten our civilization, for us to be too civilized is unquestionably to be defeated." The Communists, he continued, want us to be "too gentle, too respectable * * * [but] this is not a cream-puff war * * * and we do mean business every step of the way." Welch admitted that the technique of planted and loaded questions and the disruption of meetings was a "dirty trick," but he still defended it as another vital tactic.

To stimulate compliance by members with the local and national efforts prescribed each month in the Bulletin, Welch has devised the MMM system, or "member's monthly memos." These forms are filled out by the member detailing what he or she has done and including sundry observations on the "Americanist fight." They are then collected by the chapter leader and transmitted to Belmont. Welch and his staff, according to the Bulletin, spend much time going over the MMM's.

So far, the Birch Society has been successful in attracting to it some highly substantial figures in local communities—physicians, stockbrokers, retired military officers, lawyers, businessmen (particularly small and middle-sized manufacturers in the Midwest and South), and professionals, many of whom have become local chapter leaders and State coordinators. The council of the society is a veritable board of directors of right-fundamentalism: men like Col. Lawrence Bunker, Cola G. Parker, T. Coleman Andrews, Clarence Manion, and Spruille Braden. Among the contributing editors and editorial advisory committee for American Opinion are J. B. Matthews, William S. Schlamm, Kenneth Colegrove, J. Bracken Lee, Ludwig von Mises, Adolph Menjou, J. Howard Pew, and Albert C. Wedemeyer. In several communities, observers of the society have noted a significant number of 30 to 40-year-olds joining the organization. Welch has stated that half of the society's membership is Catholic, that there are some Jewish members, and that there are Negroes also—two segregated locals in the South and integrated chapters in the North.

Press reports suggest that most of the society's members already had strong affiliations with other rightwing groups before the Birch Society was formed. What Welch hopes to do is build a 1-million member organization by welding together the masses of right-fundamentalist joiners into the fighting educational and pressure arm of the John Birch Society. In the Bulletin and American Opinion, Welch continually offers flattering salutes to various rightwing

August 25

One reason for this extraordinarily high degree of support is that the Birch Society has become the most appealing, activist, and efficient movement to appear on the extreme right since the fertile decade of the 1930's. Birch membership at present is probably close to 60,000 and is distributed widely throughout the Nation, with particular strength in traditional centers of fundamentalism like Houston, Los Angeles, Nashville, Wichita, and Boston. This membership provides an annual dues income of \$1,300,000. Life memberships at \$1,000, special donations by wealthy supporters, and sales of society literature add perhaps \$300,000 more, giving the group a present working fund of \$1,600,000 a year. By its own count, the society has 28 staff workers in its home office in Belmont, Mass., 30 fully salaried and expense-paid traveling coordinators, and 100 partially paid or volunteer coordinators. Its jabbing forefinger has already been felt in the midsection of dozens of communities, and some commentators not prone to overestimating fringe movements warn that the society may become an effective united front for the hundreds of right-wing groups currently operating on the American scene.

All this being the case, it is worth asking what kind of group the John Birch Society is and how it compares with traditional right-wing organizations. Why has it suddenly come into prominence at this particular moment, and what are its prospects in the decade ahead?

1

However much factors like urbanization, the cold war, and status insecurities may have provided a new setting for native fundamentalists, a large and irreducible corps of such people has always existed in the United States. Unlike American liberals and conservatives—who accept the political system, acknowledge the loyalty of their opponents, and employ the ordinary political techniques—the fundamentalists can be distinguished by five identifying characteristics:

1. They assume that there are always solutions capable of producing international victories and of resolving our social problems; when such solutions are not found, they attribute the failure to conspiracies led by evil men and their dupes.

2. They refuse to believe in the integrity and patriotism of those who lead the dominant social groups—the churches, the unions, the business community, etc.—and declare that the American "establishment" has become part of the conspiracy.

3. They reject the political system; they lash out at "politicians," the major parties, and the give-and-take of political compromise as a betrayal of the fundamental truth and as a circus to divert the people.

4. They reject those programs for dealing with social, economic, and international problems which liberals and conservatives agree upon as minimal foundations. In their place, the fundamentalists propose drastic panaceas requiring major social change.

5. To break the net of conspiracy they advocate direct action, sometimes in the form of a new political party, but more often through secret organization, push-button pressure campaigns, and front groups. Occasionally direct action will develop into hate-propaganda and calculated violence.

At various periods, the United States has experienced both left-fundamentalism (the Knights of Labor, the Wobblies, the Populists, the Communists, the Trotskyites, and the Wallace Progressive) and right-fundamentalism (the Know-Nothings, the Coughlinites, the Silver-Shirts, and America First). Today, right-fundamentalism spans a broad spectrum. At one pole, with its passionate thousands, is the "hate" right, led by the

Conde McGinleys, Gerald L. K. Smiths, Admiral Grommelins, Father Terminellos, John Kaspers, and George Rockwells, who offer various combinations of anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, and anti-Negro sentiment. These groups are thoroughly discredited in contemporary America, and the major problem they present is a matter of defining the line which our law should draw between deviant expression and hate-mongering or advocacy of violence. At the opposite pole is the semi-respectable right. Here we encounter a variety of different political and educational organizations including the Foundation for Economic Education, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Committee for Constitutional Government, and the White Citizens' Councils of the South. Socially prominent figures belong to such groups, which are well-financed, often have connections with local and national major party factions, and exercise substantial lobbying influence. Their supporters and leaders may long to break with the two-party system and start a rightist party, but they are restrained by the knowledge that this would isolate them and thus diminish their present effectiveness.

The John Birch Society stands between these two poles. In the words of one of its chapter leaders in Louisville, Ky., it is a middle-of-the-road rightwing organization. In order to get a precise picture of its ideology and tactics, I have examined every published word issued by the society since its formation in 1958: in 1961 annotated edition of the "Blue Book of the John Birch Society," its operating manual and theological fount; the monthly bulletins which are sent to members and contain the agenda of activities (the 1960 issues of the bulletin are available in a bound edition titled "The White Book of the John Birch Society"); those writings of Robert Welch which have been officially incorporated and reprinted by the society (e.g., "The Life of John Birch," "May God Forgive Us," "A Letter to the South on Segregation"); and every issue of American Opinion, the monthly publication edited by Robert Welch for the society. (This was published by Welch before February 1968 under the slightly more modest title of "One Man's Opinion.")

Measured by its official materials, the authenticated accounts of Welch's speeches, and public comments by members of the society's council, the society emerges as a purebred specimen of American right-fundamentalism.

1. Its image of world events and American politics is wholly conspiratorial. In the July 1960 bulletin, Welch explains that the key to the advance of world communism "is treason right within our Government and the place to find it is right in Washington." The danger, Welch says in the Blue Book, "is almost entirely internal." And it is "a certainty," he writes in "May God Forgive Us," that there are "more Communists and Communist sympathizers in our Government today than ever before." As recently as January 1961, Welch was informing his supporters that "Communist influences are now in almost complete control of our Federal Government."

Each year since 1958, Welch and his board of experts have published a scoreboard rating all the nations of the world according to the "present degree of Communist influence and control over the economic and political affairs" of the country. In 1958, the United States was rated as 20-40 percent under Communist control; in 1959, the United States went up to 30-50 percent; and in 1960, the figure climbed to 40-60 percent. (At that pace, we will reach the 80-100 percent mark in 1964). England's rating went from 20-40 percent in 1958 to 50-70 percent in 1960. Israel is presently rated as 40-60 percent controlled; Egypt 80-100 percent.

Everywhere, the Birchers advise, Communists are at the heart of events, even some events that might seem to less skilled observers remote from Kremlin direction. In an open letter to Khrushchev in 1958, Welch said "your hands played the decisive unseen part" in the run on American banks and their closing in 1953. It was the Communist-controlled recognition of the Soviets in 1933 that "saved them from financial collapse." The "very idea of American foreign aid was dreamed up by Stalin, or by his agents for him." The "trouble in the South over integration is Communist-controlled"; the Communists have invented a "phony civil rights slogan to stir up bitterness and civil disorder, leading gradually to police-state rule by Federal troops and armed resistance to that rule." The U.S. Supreme Court "is one of the most important agencies of Communism." The Federal Reserve System is a realization of point 5 of the Communist Manifesto, calling for centralization of credit in the hands of the state. The purpose of proposed legislation requiring registration of privately owned firearms is to aid the Communists in making "ultimate seizure of such by the government easier and more complete." Everywhere, Welch concludes, the Communists are winning: in "the press, the pulpit, the radio and television media, the labor unions, the schools, the courts, and the legislative halls of America."

All the above descriptions of conspiratorial trends have been cited from official Birch Society literature, what Welch calls the society's steps to the truth. But the picture grows darker when one turns to the "Black Book," or, as it is more commonly known, "The Politician"—the book length letter which Welch circulated privately to hundreds of persons but which the society has carefully rejected as an official document. "The Politician" is to the society what Leninist dogma is to the Communist front groups in Western or neutralist nations—it is the ultimate truth held by the founder and his hard core, but it is too advanced and too powerful to present, as yet, to the masses being led. In "The Politician," Welch names names. Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower; Secretary of State John Foster Dulles; CIA Director Allen Dulles; Chief Justice Warren—all of these men are called knowing instruments of the Communist conspiracy.

It is worth noting that Eisenhower and his administration draw the strongest venom in "The Politician," just as Social Democrats do in full dose Communist literature. For Welch (a Taft supporter and McCarthy stalwart), the Eisenhower administration was a betrayal which could only have had Communists at its source. "For many reasons and after a lot of study," Welch writes, "I personally believe (John Foster) Dulles to be a Communist agent." "Allen Dulles is the most protected and untouchable supporter of communism, next to Eisenhower himself, in Washington." Arthur H. Burns' job as head of the Council of Economic Advisors "has been merely a coverup for Burns' liaison work between Eisenhower and some of his Communist bosses." "The chances are very strong that Milton Eisenhower is actually Dwight Eisenhower's superior and boss within the Communist Party." As for Dwight Eisenhower himself, Welch states unequivocally:

"There is only one possible word to describe (Eisenhower's) purpose and actions. That word is treason." "My firm belief that Dwight Eisenhower is a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy," he continues, "is based on an accumulation of detailed evidence so extensive and so palpable that it seems to put this conviction beyond any reasonable doubt." Discussing what he terms Eisenhower's "mentality of fanaticism," Welch refuses to accept the idea

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15933

helplessness because they lived with an unconquerable faith. They, of course, had their shadows, too, but they were always conscious of a Presence in the darkness. Sooner or later we pay dearly for indifference to religion. Whatever else we may say of religion this always stands first: it gives men reason for living and the power to face things as they are. It is only as man lives with a sense of eternity in his heart that he is able to stand up before life's tensions. Religion offers and guarantees to every man an adequate power to cope with life. It gives us strength equal to the need. The most profound truth of religion is that every person has a place in the purpose of God. We do not make our way alone through the world. Life is not just a commingling of atoms. History is not just a muddy stream of disconnected and unrelated events.

The universe is not just a jumble of stars and planets, and character is not just a tangled mass of twisted strands and threads which can never be untangled and untwisted to some divine design.

We shall never live fearlessly and securely until we live with a sense of God in our lives. A tree can stand against any storm if its roots are down deep enough to anchor it. It is because we live with inadequate or false philosophies that we cannot cope with the current world situation. Religion makes the profound assurance that life is a venture to be made with God. When we cease to believe that—something goes out of us. When there goes out of life an awareness of God and a sensitiveness to invisible things—we feel afraid. A sense of security depends upon a sense of reverence. What most people need who are afraid of this world situation is not a clinic but a church—not a psychiatrist but a Saviour—not a readjustment but redemption.

Unless we keep vivid in our faith the spiritual verities, seeing clearly that God is not dead and that Jesus Christ still is right and that the Sermon on the Mount is unshaken—unless we do that fear and anxiety will dominate our lives.

We must believe that he who moulds the destiny of nations is with us. Our trust must be in God and we must believe that the same divine hand which has guided us through all the perils of the past still holds the helm of our ship of state and guides us safely through every storm and every crisis.

MIGRANT LABOR AND CONGRESS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in the very near future, the Congress will have an opportunity to remove from the face of our Nation a blight which has persevered for too long. Five migratory farm-worker bills were recently reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. These bills, the first of their kind to reach the full Senate, have evolved from the work of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor under the able leadership of Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., of New Jersey.

Two of these bills, which I am pleased to cosponsor, concern the children of migratory farmworkers. One seeks to restrict agricultural child labor. The other would improve the educational opportunities for migratory farm children, and includes as well, a provision to establish adult education projects. The other three bills would provide for Federal registration of crew leaders, improved health services for migratory farm families, and the establishment of a National Advisory Council on Migratory

Labor. Congressional action in this area will extend to migratory farmworkers the benefits and protections of social legislation from which they have been excluded for nearly 30 years.

It was, therefore, with great interest that I noted the excellent New York Times editorial this past Sunday which, without reservation, urges enactment of these bills. This editorial entitled "Migrant Labor and Congress," points out:

All five bills should be promptly passed by the Senate, and their companion bills by the House. There is unanimous support in the administration for them, led by Secretary of Labor Goldberg. There can be no doubt that President Kennedy would sign them.

Because the New York Times editorial is indicative of national concern for our migratory farmworkers and their families, and because it recognizes the urgent need for legislation in this area, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 20, 1961]

MIGRANT LABOR AND CONGRESS

After far too many years of neglect by Congress it looks now as if something were going to be done to give migrant farmworkers the protection they need—and that industrial workers have long since been given. This is largely due to the outstanding efforts of Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., of New Jersey, and the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of which he is chairman, and also to a small number of dedicated social welfare agencies. Migrants have not had the facilities for propaganda and political pressure which the big unions can command.

Five migratory labor bills—the results of many months of study by the Senate subcommittee—have been introduced in the Senate by Mr. WILLIAMS, with bipartisan sponsorship, and have been favorably reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. They are due soon for action on the floor.

Most important is one (S. 1126) which requires annual Federal registration of crew leaders—the middlemen who arrange agreements between workers and growers, and furnish interstate transportation. This is designed to establish and enforce adequate standards of performance in dealing with the migrants. Other measures place limits on child labor on farms outside of school hours, give Federal financial assistance to States and local communities for the education of the migrants and their children, provide Federal grants to stimulate and support local health programs, and establish a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor to advise the President and Congress and to inform the public as to the problems of these workers and how to deal with them.

All five of the bills should be promptly passed by the Senate, and their companion bills by the House. There is unanimous support in the administration for them, led by Secretary of Labor Goldberg. There can be no doubt that President Kennedy would sign them.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a scholarly and sobering article published in Commentary magazine, issue of August 1961,

entitled "The John Birch Society, Fundamentalism on the Right." The article was prepared by Prof. Allen F. Weston, who was associate professor of public law and government at Columbia University.

The burden of the article is to analyze in historical perspective the operations and role of the John Birch Society. In it Mr. Weston suggests first, that the Birch group poisoned their own image of world events and American politics by viewing them as a wholly conspiratorial operation. Everything is conspiracy and perpetrated by conspirators.

Second, Mr. Weston suggests that the Birchers impugn the integrity and patriotism of those at the head of every major social and economic group in the country. That would include the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and other similar organizations.

Third, Mr. Weston points out that the Birchers are convinced that the Communists have gone so far in penetrating American politics that there is little hope in the existing political system of America to resolve our problems.

Fourth, he points out that most of the Birch Society's positive program consists of advocating the repeal of things or the removal of the Nation from something or somewhere—a completely negative approach in an attempt to turn back the hands of time.

Finally, Mr. Weston suggests that the Birch Society advocates both direct action and dirty tactics to break the grip of the Communist conspiracy in this country.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Commentary Magazine, August 1961]
THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY: FUNDAMENTALISM
ON THE RIGHT

(By Alan F. Weston)

Last April, the Gallup poll asked a nationwide sample of Americans whether they had heard of the John Birch Society and found that 39 million persons—an extraordinary number, according to Gallup—had read or heard of the Birchers. Of these, 47 percent had an unfavorable estimate of the society, 8 percent were favorable, and 45 percent had not yet reached a judgment. In one sense, these figures suggest a firm rejection of the Birchers by majority sentiment. But the figures also indicate that at the moment when the society was receiving its most damaging publicity—when the mass media were featuring the charge by Birch Founder Robert Welch that President Eisenhower was "a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy"—3 million persons still concluded that the society was a commendable, patriotic, anti-Communist organization. If the undecided 45 percent were to be divided in the same proportion as those who had reached a judgment (and this would probably outweigh pro-Birch sentiment), another 2½ million persons would be added to the ranks of the approving. By this estimate it can be argued, then, that at least 5½ million Americans from among the most public-affairs-conscious 40 million of our adult population were favorably impressed with the John Birch Society.